


*The
University of California
Library*



H. Morse Stephens.

University of California





HISTORY
OF
LATIN CHRISTIANITY.



HISTORY
OF
LATIN CHRISTIANITY;
INCLUDING THAT OF
THE POPES
TO
THE PONTIFICATE OF NICOLAS V.

By HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D.,
DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.

IN EIGHT VOLUMES.

VOLUME III.

UNIV. OF
NEW YORK
SHELDON AND COMPANY.

BOSTON: GOULD AND LINCOLN.

M DCCCLX.

M5

v. 3

RIVERSIDE, CAMBRIDGE :
STEREOTYPED AND PRINTED BY
H. O. HOUGHTON.

HENRY MORSE STEPHENS

TO THE
LIBRARY OF THE
MUSEUM OF COMPARATIVE ZOOLOGY

CONTENTS

OF

THE THIRD VOLUME.

BOOK V. (*continued.*)

CHAPTER III.

SARACENS IN ITALY.

A.D.		PAGE
844	Pope Sergius II. — Louis (son of Lothair) in Rome	15
847	Leo IV. Pope — Saracen invasion.....	18
	Benedict III.....	20

CHAPTER IV.

NICOLAS I. — IGNATIUS AND PHOTIUS.

857	Deposition of Ignatius — Elevation of Photius at Constantinople.....	24
858	Pope Nicolas I.....	26
862	Council at Constantinople.....	<i>ib.</i>
863	Second Council.....	29
	Photius.....	32
866	Michael the Drunkard.....	34
	Councils at Constantinople.....	35
867-877	Exile of Photius.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Reinstatement by Basil the Macedonian.....	36
879	Acknowledged by Pope John VIII.....	37
	Leo the Philosopher Emperor.....	<i>ib.</i>
861	John Archbishop of Ravenna.....	38
	Transalpine Hierarchy.....	40
860	Divorce of King Lothair.....	44

A.D.		PAGE
862	Pope Nicolas I. interferes.....	47
864	Emperor Louis in Rome.....	48
	Humiliation of great German prelates.....	49
	Hincmar of Rheims.....	51
867	Death and character of Nicolas I.....	56
	False decretals.....	58

CHAPTER V.

HADRIAN II. — HINCMAR OF RHEIMS.

867	Pope Hadrian II.....	67
869	Lothair at Rome — Death.....	68
870	Charles the Bald.....	70
	Answer of Hincmar to the Pope.....	72
	Prince Carloman.....	73
	Hincmar of Laon.....	75
871	Punishment of Carloman and of Hincmar of Laon.....	79

CHAPTER VI.

JOHN VIII. — THE SARACENS — THE DUKES OF LOWER ITALY.

872	Charles the Bald Emperor.....	83
	Danger from Saracens.....	84
	The Dukes of Naples.....	87
878	Empire vacant.....	91
	John VIII. in France — Anathemas.....	92
	Boso King of Provence.....	96
881	Athanasius of Naples.....	98
882	Pope Marinus — Hadrian III. — Stephen V.....	101

CHAPTER VII.

ANARCHY OF THE EMPIRE AND OF THE PAPACY.

887	Berengar and Guido claim the Empire.....	103
891	Pope Formosus.....	105
894	Emperor Arnulf in Italy — Coronation.....	106

A.D.		PAGE
896	Boniface VII. — Stephen VI.	110
	Rapid succession of Popes — Romanus — Theodorus	
	— John IX.	112

CHAPTER VIII.

CONVERSION OF BULGARIA.

863-4	King Bogoris — Cyril — Methodius.	116
	Questions answered by Pope Nicolas I.	118
	Moravia.	123
	Use of Slavian language.	124

CHAPTER IX.

THE NORTHMEN.

	Their ravages.	129
	Religion.	134
	St. Anschar.	136

CHAPTER X.

ALFRED.

	The Danes.	144
	Anglo-Saxon letters.	146

CHAPTER XI.

THE HUNGARIANS — DEGRADATION OF THE PAPACY.

	Hungarian inroad.	149
	Abasement of the Papacy.	151
	Benedict IV. — Leo V.	154
897	Sergius IV. Pope — Marquisate of Tuscany.	157
	Theodora and Marozia.	158
924	John X.	160
926	Hugh of Provence.	165

A.D.		PAGE
931	Marriage with Marozia — John XI. Pope.....	167
	Alberic — Insurrection of Rome.....	169
936-941	Rapid Papal succession — Leo VII. — Stephen IX. — Marinus II. — Agapetus II.....	170
	John XII. — Octavian.....	174

CHAPTER XII.

THE OTHOS ON THE IMPERIAL THRONE.

951	Otho the Great in Italy.....	176
957	Berengar and Adalbert.....	177
961-2	Pope John XII. — Otho in Rome.....	178
	Council at Rome — Degradation of the Pope — Leo VIII.....	180
964	John XII. recovers his throne.....	183
965	Benedict — John XIII.....	184
	Liutprand in Constantinople.....	186
972	Death of Otho the Great — Benedict VI.....	187
974	Bonifazio Francone — Benedict VII.....	188
983	Death of Otho II.....	189
985	John XIV. — Bonifazio — John XV.....	<i>ib.</i>
996	Otho III. in Italy.....	193
	Gregory V.....	194
	Crescentius — John XVI. — Otho III. in Rome...	195

CHAPTER XIII.

OTHO III. — POPE SILVESTER II.

	Views of Otho.....	200
	Gerbert.....	202
	Hugh Capet King of France.....	205
987	Arnulf of Rheims.....	<i>ib.</i>
981	Council of Rheims.....	208
	Gerbert Archbishop.....	211
988	Council of Meissen.....	214
	Gerbert Archbishop of Ravenna.....	215
999	Gerbert Pope — Silvester II.....	216

A.D.	PAGE
1002 Death of Otho III.....	218
1003 Death of Silvester II.....	220

CHAPTER XIV.

THE TUSCULAN POPES.

1003-12 John XVII. — John XVIII. — Sergius IV.....	222
Counts of Tusculum — Benedict VIII.....	223
1022 John XIX.....	227
1033 Benedict IX.....	229
Silvester III. — Gregory VI. buys the Papacy....	230
1044 Emperor Henry III. — Degradation of Benedict IX. and of Gregory VI.....	232



BOOK VI.

CHAPTER I.

THE GERMAN POPES.

1046 Clement II.....	236
1047 Council at Rome — Death of Clement.....	237
1048 Election and Death of Damascus II.....	239
1048 Leo IX.....	240
Enters Rome.....	242
1049 Peter Damiani.....	245
Leo's visitation beyond the Alps — in Cologne....	247
At Rheims — Council.....	251
The French hierarchy.....	252
Council at Mentz.....	255

CHAPTER II.

BERENGAR OF TOURS.

Transubstantiation.....	258
John Scotus Erigena.....	261

A.D.		PAGE
	Lanfranc	263
1050	Council at Rome — at Vercelli	264
1054	Hildebrand at Tours	267
1051	Leo's second Transalpine visitation	268
1052	Leo's third visitation	271
	Conversion of Hungary	<i>ib.</i>
1000-1036	St. Stephen	<i>ib.</i>
1052	The Emperor's unsuccessful campaign in Hungary	272
	Pope Leo at Worms	273
1053	Council at Mantua	275
1053	Leo's campaign against the Normans — defeat ..	276
1054	Captivity and death	281

CHAPTER III.

CONTINUATION OF GERMAN POPES.

1055	Gebhard of Eichstadt — Pope Victor II.	284
	Council at Florence	287
1056	Death of the Emperor Henry III.	288
1057	Council at Florence	289
	Death of Pope Victor II.	290
	Stephen IX. Pope (Frederick of Lorraine)	291
	Legate (formerly) at Constantinople	<i>ib.</i>
1058	Illness and death	294
1058-9	Nicolas II. Pope — (Benedict X. Antipope)	296
1059	Second Lateran Council — Papal election transferred to Cardinals	297
	Berengar condemned	300
	Norman alliance	301
1061	Death of Nicolas II.	303
868-891	Archbishops of Milan — Anspert	305
1018	Archbishop Heribert	306
	Archbishop Guido	312
	Marriage of clergy at Milan	313
	Landulph — Ariald	315
1059	Peter Damiani	318
1061	Anselm of Badagio, Pope Alexander II.	321

A.D.		PAGE
	Honorius II. (Cadalous) Antipope.....	322
	Benzo, Bishop of Albi.....	323
	Revolution in Germany — Hanno of Cologne...	328
1062	Council of Augsburg.....	331
1063	Pope and Antipope in Rome.....	334
	Adalbert of Bremen.....	<i>ib.</i>
	Plunder of German Abbeys.....	336
	Overthrow of Adalbert.....	339
1064	Council of Mantua.....	341
	Strife at Milan about married clergy — Herlem- bald.....	342
1075-6	at Florence.....	350
1073	Death of Alexander II. — Gregory VII.....	353

BOOK VII.

CHAPTER I.

HILDEBRAND.

	Progress of the Papacy.....	361
	Birth and youth of Hildebrand.....	364
	Peter Damiani.....	367
	Views of Hildebrand — Hierarchical caste.....	369
	Simony.....	370
	Celibacy of the clergy.....	377
	Married Clergy.....	378
	England — St. Dunstan.....	382
	Monks and secular clergy.....	386
1074	Gregory's synod at Rome.....	388
	Gregory and the King of France.....	390
	Gregory and England.....	391
	Gregory and Spain.....	393
	Hungary, Bohemia, &c.....	394

CHAPTER II.

KING HENRY IV.—CANOSA.

A.D.		PAGE
	The Papacy and the Empire.....	395
	Excommunication.....	399
	Character of Henry IV.....	403
1073	Saxon revolt.....	404
	Neutrality of the Pope.....	406
	Embassy from Rome.....	409
1074	German prelates — Synod of Erfurt.....	410
1075	Council at Rome — Investitures.....	416
	Breach between Henry IV. and the Pope.....	417
	Effects of decree against married clergy.....	419
	Hatred against Hildebrand.....	423
	Pope seized by Cencius.....	425
1076	Hildebrand's declaration against King Henry.....	427
	Synod of Worms — Pope deposed.....	430
	Third Lateran Council.....	433
	Henry deposed.....	437
	William of Utrecht.....	439
	Diet at Mentz.....	442
	Diet at Tribur.....	447
	Submission of Henry.....	450
	Gregory at Canosa.....	453
1077	Henry at Canosa.....	456

CHAPTER III.

CONTINUED STRIFE WITH KING HENRY.

	Growth of Henry's power.....	464
	Diet of Forcheim — Election of Rudolph of Swabia.....	467
1077-8	Henry in Germany.....	471
	Policy of Gregory.....	473
1079	Berengar of Tours.....	474
1080	Henry again excommunicated.....	478
	Gregory deposed at Mentz — Guibert of Ravenna	
	Antipope.....	482
	Battle of the Elster — Death of Rudolph.....	484

A.D.		PAGE
	Henry in Italy.....	485
1081-4	Three years' siege of Rome.....	487
1084	Succors from the Normans.....	491
1085	Henry master of Rome.....	492
	Normans take Rome — Insurrection — Massacre...	494
	Gregory's retirement and death.....	496

CHAPTER IV.

GREGORY'S SUCCESSORS.

	Victor III. (Desiderius of Monte Casino).....	501
	Countess Matilda.....	506
1087	Council of Benevento — Death of Victor III....	507

CHAPTER V.

URBAN II.

1088	Marriage of Countess Matilda.....	512
1090	Henry in Italy — Siege of Mantua.....	<i>ib.</i>
1093	Rebellion of Prince Conrad.....	514
1095	Council of Piacenza.....	517
	Urban II. in France.....	520
	Imperial interests revive in Italy.....	521
	Philip I. of France.....	524

HISTORY

OF

LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

BOOK V. (CONTINUED.)

CHAPTER III.

SARACENS IN ITALY.

THE Carolingian Empire expired with Louis the Pious. It separated, not so much into three kingdoms, as into three nations. Germany, France, and Italy, though governed each by a descendant of Charlemagne, and for a short time reunited under the sceptre of Charles the Fat, began to diverge more widely in their social institutions, in their form of government, in the manners and character of the people.

The imperial title was, in general, assumed by that one of the sons or grandsons of Louis the Pious ^{Lothair} who was master of Italy. First Lothair, ^{Emperor.} and then his son, Louis II., was Emperor, King of Italy, and Sovereign of the city of Rome. The right to ratify, if not the election, the consecration of the Pope, was among the imperial privileges asserted with the greatest rigor and determination.¹ At the close of the uneventful pontificate of Gregory IV., — uneventful as far as

¹ Annal. Bertiniani.

the affairs of Rome, not uneventful to those who could discern the slow but steady advancement of hierarchical pretensions¹ — the Emperor Lothair heard with indignation that the clergy and people of Rome had elected Sergius II., a Roman of noble birth, and from his youth trained in ecclesiastical duties; and that Sergius, contrary to the solemn treaty, had been at once consecrated, without awaiting his good pleasure.² The Romans had expelled John, a deacon, chosen by some of the low and rustic people.³ The haughty nobles had insisted on the condemnation of the audacious usurper. Sergius interposed to save his life. Again, we see the commonalty and the nobles in fierce strife; but the nobles, grown haughty, are less humbly imperialist. Lothair despatched immediately his son Louis with an army, and accompanied by Drogo Bishop of Metz, to punish, perhaps to degrade, the presumptuous prelate. The Franks, whose natural ferocity had not been abated by years of civil war, as if to show the resentment of the Emperor, committed frightful ravages. From the borders of the Roman territory to Bologna they advanced, wasting as they went, towards Rome. But Pope Sergius knew the strength of his position, and put forth all his religious grandeur to control the mind of the young invader. A fortunate tempest had already shaken the minds of the Franks: some of the followers of the Bishop of Metz had been struck dead by lightning, but still the army advanced with menacing haste.⁴

¹ See the famous letter of Gregory IV. ad Episcopos, written, it should seem, under the influence of the Abbot Wala. See note, vol. ii. p. 540.

² Anastasius, Vit. Sergii; Annal. Bertin. ad an. 844.

³ "Imperito et agresti populo." — Vit. Serg.

⁴ "Hoc videntes horribile signum nimis omnes timore Franci correpti

Nine miles from the city Louis was met by the civil authorities, with banners flying and loud acclamations, the military *schools*, or bands, and the people under their various standards, chanting hymns and songs of welcome. As he came nearer, the sacred crosses, which were usually reserved to grace the entrance of the Emperor into the city, were seen advancing towards him. Louis, son of Lothair, in Rome.

Louis was seized with pious fear and joy at these unexpected honors. On the steps up to the church of St. Peter he was met and embraced by the Pope. They proceeded, Louis at the right hand of the Pope, to the silver-plated doors of the church, which, however, were jealously closed. Then the Pope, by the suggestion, it was said, of the Holy Ghost, addressed the king, — “Comest thou with a pure heart and mind for the welfare of the republic, and of the whole world, and of this Church? If so, I will command that the gates be opened; if otherwise, never, with my consent, shalt thou enter therein.” The king protested that he came with no hostile or evil intent. At the touch of the prelate the doors flew open, the whole clergy burst out in the accordant chant, “Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.” The Frank army, in the mean time, were not permitted to enter the city, the gates of which were strongly guarded by the militia of Rome. A few days after Louis was anointed King of Lombardy. The Franks insisted on the Pope and the patricians of Rome swearing fealty to the king. They resolutely refused to acknowledge any allegiance but to the Emperor himself.

The degraded archbishops, Ebbo of Rheims, Barthol-

sunt. Sed nullatenus mente ferocitatem deponentes, atroci voluntate ad urbem velociter properabant.” — Vit. Sergii.

omew of Narbonne, prayed to be restored to their sees and their honors; but Drogo of Metz, the brother and faithful adherent of Louis the Pious, was at the head of the Frankish army. The Pope would grant them the humiliating permission to communicate, but to communicate only with the common people. Drogo, Bishop of Metz, son of the glorious Emperor Charles the Great, was appointed with the fullest powers Vicar of the Pope beyond the Alps.¹

Sergius died after a pontificate of three years. An unforeseen necessity enforced the immediate election of his successor, Leo IV.² The impulse of Mohammedan invasion against the still narrowing boundaries of Christendom had by no means ceased. The Saracen fleets were masters of the Mediterranean.

Sicily, with the exception of Syracuse, which made a gallant defence for some years, was in their hands.³ They had conquered Calabria, were rapidly advancing northwards, and subduing the parts of the province which still owned allegiance to the Byzantine Empire.⁴ Rome herself beheld the Moslem at her gates; the suburban churches of St. Peter and St. Paul were plundered; the capital of Christendom was in danger of becoming a Mohammedan city.⁵ The

Jan. 27, 847.
Leo IV.

Saracen invasions.

¹ Vit. Sergii.

² It is observed that under Leo IV. the form of address of the papal letters is changed. With two exceptions, the name of the person addressed is placed after that of the Pope: the title *Dominus* is dropped. — Garnier, in *Not. ad Lib. Pontiff.* Planck, iii. p. 29.

³ The progress of the Saracens was aided by the feuds among the Lombard dukes. The princes of Spoleto and Benevento and Naples had been at continual war with each other. For details, see Anonym. Salernit.

⁴ Famin (*Histoire des Invasions des Sarrasins en Italie*) describes the conquest of Sicily, and the first invasions of Italy, c. iv. — *Annal. Met. An.* Bertin. sub ann. 846. Baronius sub ann.

⁵ Famin, p. 199.

Moslemin retired on the advance of an army of Franks, according to some authorities, under the command of King Louis himself; but they retreated only to inflict a shameful defeat on the Christians, and then sate down to besiege Gaeta. The great riches of the monastery of Monte Casino escaped only by an opportune rising of the river Garigliano, attributed by the grateful Monks to a miracle.¹

But these terrible strangers might at any time return to invest the city of St. Peter. Whether to avert the danger by his prayers, to summon the Frank Protector with more commanding voice, or to strengthen the city by his administration, a Pope appeared instantly necessary to the nobles, clergy, and people of Rome.² With the utmost haste, but with reservation of the imperial rights, infringed only on account of the exigencies of the time, Leo IV. was elected, consecrated, Jan. 847. and assumed the functions of Pope. The Romans were released from their immediate terrors by the destruction of the Saracen fleet in a tempest off Gaeta. Another legend ascribed this disaster to the insulted and plundered apostles.³

Leo's first care was to provide for the future security of the Vatican and the church of St. Peter. He car-

¹ The abbey, however, had already been plundered by Sicenulf, Duke of Benevento, on pretence of employing its wealth in the wars against the Saracens. The whole account is minute and curious. Anonym. Salern. apud Muratori, Script. Ital., p. 266. According to Famin, it was taken and plundered, A.D. 844; yet he quotes the statement of Baronius, which implies that it was first threatened by the Saracens in 846. — Baronius sub ann.

² "Hoc timore et futuro casu perterriti, eum sine permissione principis consecraverant: fidem quoque illius, sive honorem, post Deum per omnia et in omnibus conservantes." — Anastas. in Vit. Leon. IV.

³ Baronius in loc.

ried out the design, before entertained by Leo III., of forming a new suburb, surrounded by strong fortifications, on the right bank of the Tiber, which might at once protect the most hallowed edifice of Christendom, and receive the fugitives who might be driven from the city by hostile incursions, perhaps by civil insurrections. This part of Rome perpetuated the name of the Pope, as the Leonine city.

The eight years of Leo's papacy¹ were chiefly occupied in strengthening, in restoring the plundered and desecrated churches of the two apostles, and adorning Rome. The succession to Leo IV. was contested between Benedict III., who commanded the suffrages of the clergy and people, and Anastasius, who, at the head of an armed faction, seized the Lateran, stripped Benedict of his pontifical robes, and awaited the confirmation of his violent usurpation by the Imperial Legates, whose influence he thought that he had secured. But these Commissioners, after strict investigation, decided in favor of Benedict. Anastasius was expelled with disgrace from the Lateran, his rival consecrated in the presence of the Emperor's representatives. Anastasius, with unwonted mercy, was only degraded to lay communion.

The Pontificate of Benedict III. is memorable chiefly for the commencement of the long strife between Ignatius and Photius for the see of Constantinople. This strife ended in the permanent schism between the Eastern and Western Churches.

¹ Leo died A.D. 855, July 17.

CHAPTER IV.

NICOLAS I. IGNATIUS AND PHOTIUS.

NICOLAS I., the successor of Benedict, was chosen rather by the favor of the Emperor Louis and his nobles than that of the clergy.¹ He has ^{April,} ^{A.D. 858.} been thought worthy to share the appellation of the Great with Leo I., with Gregory I., with Hildebrand, and with Innocent III. At least three great events signalized the pontificate of Nicolas I., — the strife of Photius with Ignatius for the archiepiscopal throne of Constantinople; the prohibition of the divorce of King Lothair from his Queen Theutberga; and the humiliation of the great prelates on the Rhine, the successful assertion of the papal supremacy even over Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims. In the first two of these momentous questions, the contest about the see of Constantinople, and that of Lothair, King of Lorraine, with his wife Theutberga, Nicolas took his stand on the great eternal principles of justice, humanity, and sound morals. These were no questions of abstruse and subtle theology nor the assertion of dubious rights. In both cases the Pope was the protector of the feeble and the oppressed, the victims of calumny and of cruelty. The Bishop of Constantinople, unjustly deposed, persecuted, exiled, treated with the worst inhumanity, implored the

¹ Prudent. Trecens. apud Pertz, i. 142. Vit. Nicolai I.

judgment of the head of Western Christendom. A queen, not only deserted by a weak and cruel husband, but wickedly and falsely criminated by a council of bishops, obtained a hearing at the Court of Rome: her innocence was vindicated, her accusers punished, the king himself compelled to bow before the majesty of justice, made more venerable by religion. If in both cases the language of Nicolas was haughty and imperious, it was justified to the ears of men by the goodness of his cause. The lofty supremacy which he asserted over the see of Byzantium awoke no jealousy, being exerted in behalf of a blameless and injured prelate. If he treated the royal dignity of France with contempt, it had already become contemptible in the eyes of mankind; if he annulled by his own authority the decree of a national council, composed of the most distinguished prelates of Gaul, that council had already been condemned by all who had natural sympathies with justice and with innocence. Yet, though in both cases Nicolas displayed equal ability and resolution in the cause of right, the event of the two affairs was very different. The dispute concerning the Patriarchate of Constantinople ended in the estrangement, the alienation, the final schism between the East and West. It was the last time that the Pope was permitted authoritatively to interfere in the ecclesiastical affairs of the East. The excommunication of the Greek by the Latin Church was the final act of separation. In the West Nicolas established a precedent for control even over the private morals of princes. The vices of kings, especially those of France, became the stronghold of papal influence: injured queens and subjects knew to what quarter they might recur for justice or for revenge. And on this

occasion the Pope brought not only the impotent king, but the powerful clergy of Lorraine, beneath his feet. The great Bishops of Cologne and of Treves were reduced to abject humiliation.

The contention for the Patriarchate of Constantinople was, strictly speaking, no religious controversy, — it was the result of political intrigue and personal animosity. Ignātius, who became the Patriarch, was of imperial descent. In the revolution which dethroned his father, Michael Rhangabe, he had taken refuge, under the cowl of a monk, from the jealousy of Leo the Armenian. The monasteries in the islands of Plato's, Hyathos, and Terebinthus, were peopled by the devout followers of Ignatius. They were the refuge of all who were persecuted for the worship of images; and to Ignatius, during that reign, the monkish and anti-Iconoclastic party looked up as a protector and a model of the austere virtue.¹ From these peaceful solitudes he had been summoned by the Empress Theodora, the mother and guardian of the Emperor Michael III. the Drunkard, to the patriarchal throne of Constantinople. His devout zeal led him to rebuke the Cæsar Bardas for his incestuous life. Bardas had divorced his own wife, and lived publicly with his son's widow. Ignatius openly repelled him from the communion. So long as the Empress Theodora, the sister of Bardas, protected the Patriarch, the Cæsar had no hope of vengeance; his ambition as well as his vindictiveness urged him to involve them both in common ruin. He persuaded the young Emperor no longer to endure the disgrace of female rule; and, in order to secure the full exercise of

¹ It must be remembered that our chief authority is Nicetas, the biographer of Ignatius, as fervent an admirer as any adoring hagiologist.

authority, counselled him to remove not only his imperious mother, and even his sisters, from the Court, but to seclude them altogether from the world. The Patriarch was commanded to dedicate these unwilling votaries to a religious life. Ignatius appealed to the canons of the Church, which allowed no one to take the vows but of their own free will; and steadily resisted the Imperial commands. A groundless charge was soon invented of treasonable correspondence with Nov. 23, 857. a pretender to the Empire. Ignatius was banished to his old retreat in the island of Terebinthus. As no power or persuasion could induce him to resign his patriarchal dignity, he was declared to be deposed, and a new Patriarch appointed in his place.

Photius was chosen as his successor. Of illustrious birth,¹ having discharged all the great offices of the State with consummate ability, and risen to its very highest dignity, Photius was esteemed the most learned and accomplished man of his age. In grammar, oratory, even in physical science, in every branch of knowledge and letters, except poetry, he stood alone. His ambition was boundless as his industry and learning; and his acceptance of the Patriarchal See may show the transcendent estimation in which ecclesiastical dignity was held in the East as in the West. Photius Dec. 25, 857. was but a layman: in six successive days he passed through the inferior orders up to the Patriarchate.

The bishops, it is said, assented to the elevation of Photius on the express condition that he should treat his deposed rival with respect and generosity. But so

¹ The patriarch Tarasius was his great uncle; another uncle had married the sister of the Empress Theodora and of Bardas.

long as Ignatius had not consented to resign his See, the tenure of the Bishopric was insecure. Ignatius and the bishops of his party suffered every kind of wanton cruelty; their sacred persons were not revered; some were beaten and exiled to remote and inhospitable parts of the Empire. One accused of too great liberty of speech had his tongue cut out.¹ The high-born and blameless Patriarch himself was seized, carried away from his splendid and peaceful monastery, loaded with chains, hurried from one desolate place to another, and at last confined in Mitylene. Rival councils met, and the two Patriarchs were alternately excommunicated by the adverse spiritual factions.

Photius was the first to determine on an appeal to Rome. The Pope, he thought, would hardly resist the acknowledgment of his superiority, with the tempting promise of the total extirpation of the hated Iconoclasts. The Emperor sent a solemn embassy, entreating that Legates might be commissioned to assist him in his holy work, and to restore the decaying discipline. On the part of Photius four bishops were sent to assure the Pope that Ignatius, oppressed by age and infirmities, had retired from the Bishopric; that in his retirement he was treated with profound respect; that Photius had been lawfully chosen to the vacant See. He added the most humble asseverations of his own conscious unworthiness, and the strong reluctance with which he had undertaken the awful function. "The clergy, the bishops, the emperor, benignant to all, cruel to me alone, without listening to my entreaties, untouched

¹ Photius, in a remarkable letter to the Cæsar, deprecates in the strongest terms these barbarities. Epist. vi.

by my tears, have compelled me to bear this heavy burden.”¹

Nicolas was no doubt better acquainted than was supposed with the state of ecclesiastical affairs in the East. He answered with caution and dignity, that his legates could only judge on the spot as to the validity of the very questionable ordination of Photius. In the presence of his legates and a lawful council Ignatius must Sept. 25, 860. acknowledge his resignation. In his reply to the Emperor, Nicolas seized the opportunity of reclaiming the estates of the Church in Sicily, and the jurisdiction over Illyricum, Epirus, Thessaly, and other parts of Greece, which had been usurped by the Archbishop of Thessalonica. Throughout the behavior and language of Nicolas there is no sign of admitted subjection to the Eastern Emperor: even its tradition seems forgotten. He writes as a great independent religious potentate, as the head of Christendom, treating the Emperor at first with the courtesy becoming a powerful sovereign, but not as one to whom himself owed allegiance.

The legates, with this calm and guarded reply, arrived at Constantinople, to the disappointment of Photius and of the Emperor. Photius was indignant that he was not acknowledged under his title of bishop; the Emperor received the legates, not as ambassadors from a foreign power, but as insolent subjects. They were imprisoned, threatened with banishment: they yielded

¹ Photii, Epist. i. ad Nicol. Papam. It has been reprinted in a *Vie de Photius*, by the Abbé Jager, one of those modern French works which would disdain the praise of candor and impartiality. I shall not accuse him of it. But M. Jager has the merit of justly appreciating the high merit of Photius, for his day most unusually accomplished as a scholar; and the extraordinary beauty of some of his letters, a merit very rare in Greek literature.

to these sterner or to milder means of persuasion, to direct bribery.¹ Ignatius was summoned to appear before a council in the presence of the papal legates. This council boasted that it was formed of exactly A.D. 862. the same number of prelates as sate in the venerable assembly at Nicea. The Patriarch's firmness for a time stayed the proceedings. He demanded who the legates were, and for what purpose they sate in Constantinople? They replied that they were the legates of Nicolas, the supreme pontiff, sent to judge his cause.² "First," answered the intrepid Patriarch, who appeared in the garb of a simple monk, "drive out the adulterer. If ye cannot, ye are no judges." He appealed to the Pope in person. The council pronounced his deposition; and as it were, to propitiate the Pope, in their second session condemned Iconoclasm. But this was not enough. Still all means of persuasion and cruelty were used to extort the resignation of Ignatius.³ At length, it is said, while he lay senseless in his prison,

¹ Anastasius (in Vit. Nicolai I.) and the Pope himself (Epist. x. ad Cle- rum Constantin.) assert distinctly that they were bribed. The most extraordinary menace was, that not only they should suffer exile, but be food for vermin from their own bodies. "Longa exilia et diuturnas pediculorum comessationes." This might seem beneath the dignity of history, were it not in the Pope's own letter, and so, it should seem, rests on the authority of the legates themselves. — Also, Phot. Epist. vi. p. 286.

² The legates suppressed the parts of the Pope's letter which warned them to decide nothing, and read only that which related to the Iconoclasts.

³ If we are to believe the monkish writers, the cruelty of all orders, even to ecclesiastics of the highest rank, shows a most savage state of manners. The ingenious tortures inflicted on Ignatius, it is said, by command of the Emperor and of Photius, are absolutely revolting. Another respectable prelate, who had been Bishop of Crete at the time of the Saracen conquest, now become Bishop of Thessalonica, ventured during an earthquake to remonstrate with the young Emperor against his profane mimicry of the religious ceremonies of the Church, he was beaten so as to knock out two of his teeth, and scourged almost to death. — Nicet. Vit. Ignat. Labbe, p. 1218.

his unconscious hand was forced to trace the sign of a cross on a blank paper, on which Photius superscribed a confession of his uncanonical election to the Patriarchate, which he had ruled as an usurper and a tyrant. In possession of this document, Photius allowed his rival a short interval of repose.¹ He was permitted to retire to a palace which had belonged to his mother. Rumors of new and more horrible persecutions meditated against him induced him to fly from the capital.² He found means to baffle his pursuers; till an earthquake, as in the time of his great predecessor, Chrysostom, shook Constantinople with guilty dread, and seemed the voice of Heaven rebuking the unjust usage of the Patriarch. He was permitted to return to the city.

In the mean time the sentence of his deposition by the Synod of Constantinople had been communicated to the Pope, with a letter of great length from Photius.³ The Pope took at once the highest ground. He summoned a council of the Roman Church; disclaimed his

¹ Photius is accused of forgery, or of conniving at the forgery of two favorable letters from the Pope. The trick was detected by the Cæsar Bardas. — Nicet. in Vit.

² Among the cruelties and insults which Photius is charged with heaping on his rival, he is said to have given him up shamelessly to the mockery of mimes and stage-players. "Et ad illudendum mimis et scenicis inverecundè proderes." — Nicol. ad Phot. Epist. x. p. 372.

³ Part of this letter is striking and beautiful. Photius describes, with seeming sincerity, the enjoyments of his state as a layman, in the society of his attached friends and the quiet study of letters, and his profound regret that he had abandoned those more congenial occupations. ἐξέπεσον εἰρηνικῆς ζωῆς, ἐξέπεσον γαλήνης γλυκείας, ἐξέπεσον δὲ καὶ δόξης (εἶπερ τισὶ καὶ κοσμικῆς δόξης ἔφευγες), ἐξέπεσον τῆς φίλης ἡσυχίας, τῆς καθαρῶς ἐκείνης καὶ ἡδίστης μετὰ τῶν πλησίων συνουσίας, τῆς ὑλύπου, καὶ ὑδόλου, καὶ ἀνεπιπλήκτου συναποστροφῆς. The latter part vindicates his sudden promotion from the rank of a layman to the patriarchate, by the unanswerable examples of his predecessors Nestorius and Tarasius, and that of St. Ambrose of Milan.

weak and unauthorized legates, and in the presence of the imperial ambassador refused his consent to the deposal of Ignatius, to the elevation of Photius.

Not merely did he address two lofty and condemnatory letters to the Emperor and to Photius, A.D. 862. but a third, also, to "the faithful in the East," at the close of which he made known to the three Eastern Patriarchs his steadfast resolution to maintain the cause of Ignatius, to refuse the recognition of the usurper Photius. He called upon them to concur in the decrees of the Apostolic See.

Early in the next year a monk named Theognetus, a messenger of Ignatius, appeared in Rome with the full account of all the hard usage endured by his A.D. 863. master. A more august council was now summoned, of which the first act was to degrade and excommunicate Zacharias, one of the papal legates, for his weakness in consenting to the deposition of Ignatius. The Pope then pronounced the unanimous sentence of condemnation against Photius; recounting his Decree against Photius. offences, and involving under the same anathema Gregory, Bishop of Syracuse, who had presumed to consecrate the usurper of the Constantinopolitan See.¹ All the acts of Photius, especially his ordinations, were declared null and void. The restoration of Ignatius was commanded even in more imperious language, and under more awful sanctions. "We, by the power committed to us by our Lord through St. Peter, restore our brother Ignatius to his former station, to his see, to

¹ Nicolas neglected no means of carrying his point. He did not disdain female influence. Besides letters to the clergy of the East, and to the senate of Constantinople, he wrote to the mother and to the wife of the Emperor to maintain the cause of Ignatius, to reject the adulterer of the see, the usurper, the neophyte Photius. — Epist. Nicol. I.

his dignity as Patriarch, and to all the honors of his office. Whoever, after the promulgation of this decree, shall presume to disturb him in the exercise of his office, separate from his communion, or dare to judge him anew, without the consent of the Apostolic See, if a clerk, shall share the eternal punishment of the traitor Judas; if a layman he has incurred the malediction of Canaan: he is excommunicate, and will suffer the same fearful sentence from the eternal Judge."

Never had the power of the clergy or the supremacy of Rome been asserted so distinctly, so inflexibly. The privileges of Rome were eternal, immutable, anterior to, derived from no synod or council, but granted directly by God himself: they might be assailed, but not transferred; torn off for a time, but not plucked up by the roots. An appeal was open to Rome from all the world, from her authority lay no appeal.¹

The Emperor and Constantinople paid no regard to these terrible anathemas of the Pope. As long as he possessed the favor of the Emperor, Photius remained in undisturbed possession of his see. An angry correspondence was kept up between the Emperor and the Pope. In the Emperor's letter he seems (for his letter is only known by the Pope's reply) to have addressed the Pope as a refractory and contumacious subject. He threatens Rome itself with fire and sword. Nicolas

¹ The Emperor, it appears, had demanded that his disloyal subject, the monk Theognetus, the messenger of Ignatius to Rome, should be delivered up. "Many thousands," replies the Pope, "come to Rome every year, and place themselves devoutly under the protection of St. Peter. We have the power of summoning monks, and even clergy, from every part of the world: you, O Emperor, have no such power; you have nothing to do with monks, but humbly to entreat their prayers." Never would he surrender to a worldly sovereign a monk, who by his profession declared his contempt for palaces, for all the honors, dignities, and gifts which kings could bestow.

maintains his haughty independence,¹ treats these idle menaces with contempt. He significantly reminds the Emperor of the fate of Sennacherib; and tauntingly reproaches him with his dastardly submission to the Saracens. "We have not invaded Crete; we MAY 25, 865. have not depopulated Sicily; we have not subdued the countless provinces of Greece; we have not burned the churches in the very suburbs of Constantinople; yet, while these pagans conquer, waste, burn with impunity, we Catholic Christians are menaced with the vain terrors of your arms. Ye release Barabbas, and put Christ to death." Nicolas concludes with evoking the whole cause to Rome, cites the two conflicting parties, Ignatius and Photius at least by his representative, as well as the other bishops personally, to submit NOV. 13, 866. themselves to his tribunal. On the faithful fulfilment of these terms, he will condescend to allow the Emperor to communicate with the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, with himself specially, and his brother priest, Ignatius. In conclusion, he ominously reminds him of the fate of the Emperors, the persecutors of the Church, Nero, Dioclesian, Constantius, Anastasius; the glory of those who have been its faithful friends and servants. In another letter—the strife was now dragging on its fourth year—Nicolas enjoins the Emperor to burn the blasphemous and filthy letter with which he has dared

¹ The Emperor (or was it the insolence of the Greek scholar Photius?) had spoken of the Latin language as a barbarous Scythian jargon. The indignant Pope replies, that to censure that language is to censure its maker, God; that it was one of the languages inscribed on the cross; that the Scythians are idolaters, and only use Latin to worship God; that some of the services even in the churches of Constantinople were in Latin. "Let the Emperor cease to call himself Emperor of the Romans, or abstain from insulting the Roman language." It is curious to see Latin on the defensive.

to insult the Holy See ; if he refuses, the Pope will himself summon an assembly of prelates, anathematize all who favor or maintain these documents, and, to his eternal disgrace, cause the Emperor's missive publicly to be suspended over a slow fire in the sight of all the nations who reverence the throne of St. Peter.

At length Photius determined to keep no terms with Photius. his unrelenting adversary. The letters no doubt of the Emperor asserted, among other blasphemies, so called at Rome, the independence of the Byzantine See. He must now maintain that independence. All his submission, the tempting lure which he had offered, the total suppression of Iconoclasm, had been treated with scorn : he had found himself strangely mistaken in the man whom he had found in the papal chair ; he might have supposed Nicolas, like one of his immediate predecessors, only the head of a faction in Rome, the timid vassal of the Western Emperor. Nicolas, as he knew, was involved in the strife with King Louis, on account of the repudiation of his wife.

Pope Nicolas was now the aggressor. Bardas, the protector of Photius, suspected or known to aspire to the Empire, had been cut to pieces.¹ Michael ruled alone, or rather had surrendered the rule to Basil the Macedonian, soon to supplant him in the Empire. A new legation arrived at Constantinople : it demanded Nov. 866. that Photius and Ignatius should be sent to Rome for judgment. But Photius had changed with the times ; his skilful flatteries had secured the protection of Michael, or he was too strong not to be protected. The fame, the accomplishments, the acknowl-

¹ A letter to Bardas likewise appears ; it must, I think, be of earlier date : Nicolas can hardly have been ignorant of his fate six months before.

edged eloquence,¹ even the virtues of Photius, had now obtained great influence with all orders.

In the year 867 he had summoned a council at Constantinople: the obsequious prelates listened Synod at Constantinople. to the arraignment, and joined in the counter excommunication, of Pope Nicolas. Photius drew up eight articles inculcating in one the faith, in the rest the departure of the See of Rome from ancient and canonical discipline.² Among the dreadful acts of heresy and schism which were to divide forever the Churches of the East and West were:—I. The observance of Saturday as a fast. II. The permission to eat milk or cheese during Lent. IV. The restriction of the chrism to the Bishops. VI. The promotion of deacons at once to the Episcopal dignity. VII. The consecration of a lamb, according to the hated Jewish usage. VIII. The shaving of their beards by the clergy. The fifth only of the articles objected by Photius, the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, was an error so awful as to deserve a thousand anathemas. The third, condemning the enforced celibacy of the clergy, was alone of high moral or religious importance. “From this usage we see, in the West,” says Photius, “so many children who know not their fathers.” These, however, were but the pretexts for division. The cause lay deeper, in the total denial of the papal supremacy by the Greeks; their unequivocal assertion that with the empire that supremacy had passed to Constantinople.³

¹ The young, it is said, crowded in rapture to the schools, where he still delivered his attractive lectures.

² These were mostly the points of difference which in his letter to Nicolas he had treated as of no importance.

³ “Cum etiam glorientur et perhibeant quando de Romanâ urbe Impera-

The decree of the council boasted the signature of the Emperor (obtained, it was said, in an hour of drunkenness); of Basil the Macedonian, averred (most improbably) to have been forged; of the three Eastern Patriarchs; of the senate and the great officers; of abbots and Bishops to the number of nearly one thousand.

But the Episcopal messenger who was to bear to Rome this defiance of the Church of Constantinople and the counter-excommunication of the Pope, had proceeded but a short way on his journey when he was stopped by the orders of the new Emperor. A revolution in the palace was a revolution in the Church of Constantinople. The Drunkard was an ill-omened name for the patron of a Bishop—and the drunkenness of Michael aggravated rather than excused his profane diversions. It was said to be his common amusement to mimic with low and dissolute companions the holiest rites of the Church. This unworthy monarch Sept. 24, 867. was hurled from his throne; another Emperor ruled in the East. The first act of Basil the Macedonian was to depose Photius. Photius is said to have refused the communion to the murderer Basil. From this time a succession of changes agitated the Empire: Photius rose or fell at each successive change.¹

A hostile council was assembled; among these were

tores Constantinopolin sunt translati, hinc et primatum Romanæ sedis ad Constantinopolitanam ecclesiam transmigrasse, et cum dignitatibus regiis etiam ecclesiæ Romanæ privilegia.—Epist. lxx. Nicol. I. ad Hincmar. p. 472.

¹ There is a very curious account in Nicetas of two books said to have been found in the possession of Photius; one, illustrated with caricatures, of the life and acts of Ignatius; one the account of the Council of Constantinople. They were produced and trampled under foot at Rome. One, it is said, was translated into Latin.

ecclesiastics, appearing as representatives of the three Patriarchates now under the Mohammedan sway, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem.¹ The legates of the Pope, Hadrian, who had already received the ambassadors of the Emperor, condemned Photius, and approved the restoration of Ignatius, were present. No one was permitted to take his seat till he had signed a formulary anathematizing all heretics, Iconoclasts, and Photius, and also condemnatory of the late council. Those who had communicated with the usurper were received only after having done penance. Some contumacious prelates, who refused to prejudge the cause which they were assembled to consider, were ignominiously expelled from the council.² All the ordinations of Photius were declared void. The crimes, the calumnies of Photius, who was dragged before the council by the Emperor's guard, were rehearsed before his face. He stood mute: his degradation was at once determined; and so fierce was the resentment, that, not content with dipping their pens in the ink with which they were to sign his condemnation, they wrote it in the Sacramental wine, as it is plainly said, in the blood of Christ.³ The biographer of Ignatius bitterly deplores the lenity of the council; he does not explain what measures he wished them to adopt, but to their mistimed tenderness he ascribes all the evils of the second elevation of Photius. He

¹ The representatives of these sees at the Council of Photius are of course impostors; those at the present real and authentic representatives. This is received as the eighth General Council by the Latin Church.

² Yet Photius found some defenders; Euthimius, Bishop of Cæsarea, Zacharias of Chalcedon.

³ ἅλλα τὸ φρικωδέστατον, ὡς καὶ εἰδότες ἀκήκοα διαβεβαιουμένων, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ Σωτῆρος τῷ αἵματι βάπτοντες τὸν κάλαον — Nicet. Vit. Ignat. p. 1231.

interprets a terrible earthquake, which threw down many churches, and a furious tempest, as the remonstrances of Heaven against this weak leniency. Other signs, on the same authority, glorified the restoration of Ignatius. By a new kind of Transubstantiation, the consecrated bread glowed like a live coal from heaven, and the cross over the altar was agitated by a gentle motion.

Photius, in his exile, heard of this appalling earthquake. He rejoiced that he was relieved from beholding the sufferings of his people; he is strongly tempted even to suggest that it is a protest of Heaven against the injustice done to him by the council. That council, in his epistles, he treats as a violent, unjust, lawless synod; a synod of furious bacchanals, avowedly met not to judge, but to ratify his predetermined condemnation. For ten years Ignatius ruled in peace.¹ On his death there was a strange reaction in favor of his proscribed, banished, persecuted rival. Photius, it is said, from his monastic retreat, administered such skillful flattery to the Emperor, that by Basil's command he was reinstated in the See of Constantinople. So write his enemies. It is more likely that his transcendent learning and accomplishments,² a strong feeling that his crimes had been exaggerated by his implacable adversaries, some lurking jealousy that Constantinople had too completely subjected herself to Rome, may have led to his second rise. A new council, at which were present two Papal legates, ratified the eleva-

¹ Even Ignatius had maintained against Rome his right to jurisdiction over the Bulgarians. He was in his turn threatened with canonical censures. — Hadrian, *Epist. ad Imperat.*, Labbe.

² Among the most bitter and pathetic lamentations of Photius in his exile is the being deprived of his books.

tion of Photius. The Pope himself, John VIII. (Nicolas and his successor, Hadrian II., had disappeared from the scene), acquiesced in the decision.

The Pope acknowledged the usurper, the monster of wickedness, the persecutor, the heretic, him who had dared to assert the co-equality, the supremacy of Constantinople to Rome, as the legitimate Patriarch.¹

Photius fell again at the death of his new patron. Leo the Philosopher, the son of Basil, once more ignominiously expelled him from his throne. Yet, though accused of treason, Photius was acquitted, and withdrew into honored retirement. He did not live to witness or profit by another revolution. Though the schism of thirty years, properly speaking, expired in A.D. 886. his person, and again a kind of approximation to Rome took place, yet the links were broken which united the two churches. The articles of difference, from which neither would depart, had been defined and hardened into rigid dogmas. During the dark times of the Papacy which followed the disruption, even the intercourse became more and more precarious. The Popes of the next century were too busy in defending their territories or their lives to regard the affairs of the East. The darkness which gathered round both churches shrouded them from each other's sight.

Nicolas the Great had not lived to triumph even in

¹ Photius is accused of interpolating letters of Pope Leo, certainly much amplified in the Greek translations from the Latin copies, as they now exist, and there are suspicious passages, highly adulatory of Photius, and one suppression (Epist. 97). There are others so much stronger in the Greek that we cannot attribute them to so adroit a writer as Photius. Baronius supposes this *feminine* weakness of John VIII. to have given rise to the fable of Pope Joan! Was an act of peace and conciliation the monstrous and painful travail which revealed her sex?

the first fall of Photius. In the West his success was more complete; he had the full enjoyment of conscious power exercised in a righteous cause. Not merely did he behold one of Charlemagne's successors prostrate at his feet, obliged to abandon to papal censure and to degradation even his high ecclesiastical partisans, but in succession the greatest prelates of the West, the Archbishop of Ravenna, the Archbishops of Cologne and Treves, and even Hincmar, the Archbishop of Rheims, who seemed to rule despotically over the Church and kingdom of France, were forced to bow before his vigorous supremacy.

John, Archbishop of Ravenna, is accused of immoderate ambition and avarice, of determined hostility, and a deep, deliberate design of emancipating his see from the domination of Rome. He had taken possession of certain estates claimed by the Roman see, deposed, excommunicated, imprisoned of his own authority all who made resistance, usurped in favor of St. Apollinaris, the tutelar saint of Ravenna, the privileges of St. Peter; treated the citations of the Pope to appear before his tribunal, or before a synod at Rome, to answer for certain heretical opinions charged against him, with the utmost contempt; though excommunicated by that synod, he persisted in the same disdainful contumacy.¹ He aspired, no doubt, to set up the jurisdiction of Ravenna, which he extended beyond its usual limits, as independent, if not superior to Rome. Unless as having been the imperial residence, the seat of empire, it is impossible to understand on what grounds the archbishop rested his haughty

¹ "Missos illius spernebat, et gloriam beati Petri Apostoli, quantum in se erat, evacuabat." — Anastas. Vit. Nicol. I.

pretensions. Ecclesiastical must, according to his theory, have humbly followed the civil supremacy.

But John was a man of harsh and unpopular character. At first, indeed, he was successful in his appeal to the Emperor Lothair for his interposition. Accompanied by two imperial officers he arrived at Rome. But Nicolas mildly rebuked the ambassadors of the Emperor for presuming to enter into such relations with an excommunicated person ; they abandoned his defence. The archbishop, refusing to acknowledge the authority of the Pope, retired from Rome. But his own city did not espouse his cause.¹ At the invitation of the principal inhabitants the Pope visited Ravenna ; he was received with the warmest welcome by the nobles, and with the acclamations of the people. John fled to Pavior again to implore the succor of the Emperor. As he passed along the streets the doors were closed, and the citizens shrank from the followers of the excommunicated prelate as from infected persons. From the Emperor himself he received this contemptuous message, — “ Let him go and humble himself before that great Pope to whom we and the whole Church submit in obedience.” The proud prelate had no alternative but with tears to implore the mercy of his adversary : and Nicolas, having completed his humiliation by enforcing a public oath of allegiance, and of the most full and loyal obedience, on the most sacred reliques, on the cross and sandals of Christ, and on the four Gospels, condescended to receive him Nov. 1, 862. into communion. The terms of his reconciliation were such as to ensure the complete submission of the See of

¹ Agnelli, Vit. Pontific. Ravenn. apud Muratori. John was accused of tyranny over his suffragan bishops. They were not allowed “ limina Apostolorum adire.”

Ravenna. The archbishop was to present himself, unless prevented by illness or unavoidable necessity, once a year at Rome; to consecrate no bishop but after his election by the Duke, the clergy, and the people, and on the sanction, by letter, of the apostolic see; to allow all his bishops free access for appeal to Rome; to surrender all contested property to which he could not establish his claim in the courts of law. So ended this opposition to the papal supremacy in Italy.¹

If power and wealth could have secured independence, the extraordinary rise of the sacerdotal order throughout the Transalpine Carlovingian Empire, more especially of the great metropolitan prelates in France and on the Rhine, during the decline of that dynasty, might have been formidable to the Roman supremacy, if asserted by a timid or a feeble Pontiff. It was not the Pope alone, but all the clergy, who were a permanent undying corporation, as compared with the temporal nobility. The hierarchy had risen, and were still rising, in proportion to the decay,

Transalpine
hierarchy.

¹ "Ut nullus amodo et deinceps Archiepiscopus Ravennæ ad vestra Episcopia sine voluntate vestrâ accedere temptet vel aliquam pecuniam a vobis exigere . . . vel res ecclesiæ vestræ, aut monasteria vestra, sive prædia, per quodvis ingenium diripere audeat." The metropolitan power of Ravenna was annulled. The estates of Ravenna in Sicily seem to have been seized and appropriated by Rome. — Agnelli, p. 103. Yet the ambition of the Archbishops of Ravenna was not extinguished by this discomfiture and spoliation. At the famous battle of Fontanet appeared George, Archbishop of Ravenna, with 300 horses loaded with treasures taken, to the indignation of the clergy, from the churches. George had been consecrated at Rome, but aspired to assert the independence of Ravenna. This wealth was to purchase the Emperor Lothair's favor at this critical juncture. But he chose the wrong side. He was taken, robbed of his treasures, stripped of all to a sorry nag, on which he was led before the conqueror, Charles the Bald. By Charles he was bitterly reproached for deserting his flock and appearing in the front of the battle. He was pardoned by the merciful intervention of the Empress Judith, and resumed his see. — Agnelli, p. 185.

and partly out of the ruins of the great temporal feudatories. That military aristocracy was exhausting itself with unexampled rapidity ; it disdained to recruit itself from the lower orders ; and every family which became extinct weakened the power of the temporal nobles. The civil wars, the wars against the Normans, not now confined to the coasts, but ravaging the inland provinces (they had sacked Paris, Ghent, Hamburg, Cologne) ; the libertinism of manners, which crowded the halls of the nobles with spurious descendants, often without perpetuating the legitimate descent ; devotion, which threw many who might have kept up the noblest families into the Church or the cloister ; the alienation of their estates, through piety or superstition, to sacred uses ; — all these causes conspired to drain away the riches and the power of the nobility.

But the perpetual Church was always ready to acquire, and forbidden to alienate, and was protected, even in these wild times, at least in ^{Its perpetuity.} comparative security, by awful maledictions against believers, by miracles which seemed constantly at their command, against heathens as well as Christians. Its immortal order rested on no precarious or hereditary descent. The cathedral or the monastery might be burned, as was sometimes the case in the Norman inroads, the clergy and the monks massacred. A new generation arose immediately among the ruins, resumed their wasted estates, and repaired their shattered buildings. The metropolitan or the bishop had always an heir at hand : the transmission of his sacred property, though sometimes diverted from its proper use by hierarchical prodigality or by Episcopal nepotism, descended on the whole in the right line. All these losses

were more than recompensed by unchecked and unscrupulous acquisitions. The Church at times was plundered: all possessions were precarious during the long anarchy which followed the death of Louis the Pious; the persons of the priesthood were not secure. But still it renewed its strength, recovered its dilapidated resources; found some latent power which brought it back to its commanding superiority. It ever retrieved its losses, revenged itself for its humiliations, and still grew on under every, it might seem, fatal change in the political atmosphere.

France and part of Germany, but especially France, had become a kind of feudal theocracy. Ecclesiastical councils almost superseded the Diets of the nation.¹ Bishops and abbots, themselves nobly born, outnumbered the temporal nobles. The descendants of Charlemagne were surrounded by a tonsured, not an armed aristocracy; the greater part of the royal army was levied by the prelates of the Church. Even the royal family, ambitious of real power, were constantly intruding themselves into the more wealthy bishoprics or abba-cies.

The superiority of the clergy even over the Crown Power. was openly and distinctly asserted. Kings were not exempt from that general obedience enjoined by the Apostle.² The clergy ruled the laity through

¹ Nithard says, on occasion of the alliance of Charles and Louis against Lothair, "*Primum quidem visum est, ut rem ad Episcopos sacerdotesque quorum aderat pars maxima, conferret, ut illorum consultu, veluti numine divino, harum rerum exordium atque auctoritas proderetur.*" — l. iv. c. i. These were purely secular matters, and this is the usual language. Compare c. iv.

² Hincmar (*De Divortio Hl. et Theut.*), who not only asserted but exercised also this power, quotes, as a sentence of Pope Gelasius, that the pontifical is higher than the royal power, because the clergy have to render an

their vices, but chiefly vices of one kind. They were the appointed, the heaven-delegated guardians of conubial morals; to them belonged all matrimonial causes; no one, not the highest in the realm, was exempt from their interference. And if their judgments had always been superior to unworthy influences, and if, in these lawless times, they had equally opposed, as some no doubt did, oppression, inhumanity, injustice, their rule might have mitigated far more the ferocious manners, and assisted in blending together the hostile orders and races. But instead of Christianizing the world, themselves had become secularized. They were stern barons or haughty dukes, rather than peaceful prelates and humble teachers of the gospel. It might, indeed, seem that, at this time, the only important public affairs were the domestic relations of the Sovereign. That license which Charlemagne indulged without check or remonstrance, was denied to his feebler descendants. Council after council met on questions of adultery, divorce, and incest. Judith, daughter of Charles the Bald, had married successively Ethelwolf, ^{Matrimonial causes.} King of England; Ethelbald, her step-son (a connection which shocked all feeling); and Baldwin, Count of Flanders, who had carried her off and married her with her own consent.¹ Here prudence somewhat checked the moral zeal of the Church. The Pope intercedes in favor of Baldwin, lest he should revolt to the Pagan Normans. Another council, that of Toul, was called to annul the marriage of Stephen, Count of

account even of kings to God. He cites the restoration of Louis the Pious as an act of Episcopal authority. "Nostrâ ætate Hludovicum Augustum a regno dejectum, *post satisfactionem*, episcopalis unanimitas, saniore concilio, cum populi consensu, et ecclesiæ et regno restituit." — p. 473.

¹ Nicol. Pap. Epist. Carolo Calvo. 862, Nov. 23.

Auvergne, with the daughter of Raimond, Count of Toulouse, because a relation of his wife's had been his mistress. The Pope himself took cognizance, in a council at Rome, of the divorce of Ingeltruda from her husband, Count Boso, by whom she had been abandoned.

The matrimonial cause, however, which for many years distracted part of France, on which council after council met, and on which the great prelates of Lorraine came into direct collision with the Pope, and were reduced to complete and unpitied humiliation under his authority, was that of King Lothair and his Queen, Theutberga.

This nobility, at once of race and order, which was the strength of the Carlovingian hierarchy, of nobility by birth, and of power by ecclesiastical dignity, was that which was most likely to grow up into natural independence, to resist all foreign supremacy, and, unless met with an intrepid and firm assertion of delegated divine authority, to shake off all subordination. In the struggle with Pope Nicolas the Frank clergy espoused a bad cause, one in which the moral, as well as religious sympathies of mankind were against them. When, in the character of guardians of public and private virtue, they countenanced gross immorality, the abrogation of their unjust decrees by the Pope carried with it the general sentiment. The whole affair is a monstrous tissue of indecency, cruelty, and injustice. To know the times must be known this trial, which so long occupied the clergy of the West.

Lothair II., King of Lorraine, the second son of the Emperor Lothair, had married Theutberga, the daughter of Boso, the powerful Count of Burgundy. Soon after his marriage he had dismissed her, from disinclina-

tion or a former attachment, from his court. The popular feeling had compelled him to restore her A.D. 860. to her conjugal honors ; but he would not bear the yoke. Publicly before the officers and great vassals of his court, he accused her of incest with her brother, Hubert, Abbot of St. Maurice.¹ This revolting charge was made more loathsome by minute circumstances, contradictory and impossible.² Yet on this charge the obsequious nobility, with the consent of the clergy, put the unhappy queen upon her trial. She demanded the ordeal of hot water ;³ her champion passed through unhurt ; and who should presume now to doubt her innocence ? She was restored at least to her rank and to outward respect, but treated with such petty and harassing cruelty, that at length the weary woman made a public confession of her impossible crime. A synod of the clergy was convoked at Aix-la-Chapelle ; it was attended by the Archbishops of Cologne and Treves ; the Bishops of Metz, Tongres, Verdun, Melun, and Autun. Their first decree not only released, but inter- Divorce.dicted Lothair from all connection with his adulterous

¹ Compare throughout, if thought fit, the treatise of Hincmar, *De Divortio Hlotharii et Theutbergæ*. The questions submitted to the archbishop are only surpassed in their offensiveness by their absurdity. Hincmar discusses them with minute obscenity, protesting that he and his fellow bishops are entirely ignorant of such matters, and only acquired their knowledge by reading.

² Not from the high character of the Abbot, whose discipline at St. Maurice was of the loosest ; he lived himself with dancing girls. His brother-in-law made him a duke. — *Epist. Benedict III.*, 857. He seems to have lived as a layman.

³ In Hincmar there is a curious discussion on the ordeal. The archbishop draws a strange mystical analogy with the Deluge, in which the wicked were destroyed by water, the just saved : the fire in which Sodom was destroyed, Lot escaped. The ordeal was held to be a kind of baptism. The wiser Archbishop, Agobard of Lyons, wrote against the ordeal, as against some other superstitions of his time.

wife; the second enforced a public penance on the unhappy Theutberga.

But separation alone was not the object of Lothair. He had lived in open concubinage with Waldrada, it has been said, without sufficient proof, the sister of Gunther, Archbishop of Cologne, and niece of Theotgand, Archbishop of Treves.¹ A third council assembled at A.D. 862. Aix-la-Chapelle. At this council, too, appeared the Archbishops of Cologne and Treves, Adventius of Metz, Franko of Tongres, Atto of Verdun, Arnulf of Toul, the Bishops of Utrecht and Strasburg. The king pleaded preëngagement to Waldrada, and declared that he only married the daughter of Boso because her father's alliance was absolutely necessary in the perilous state of the kingdom. The canon laws against incest were read, the confession of Theutberga recited,² the marriage declared void, and Waldrada proclaimed the lawful queen. She appeared in public in all the array and splendor of the king's wife.³

¹ Sismondi quotes as authority for this relationship the *Annales Metenses*, "according to which," he says, "Gunther and Theotgand were excommunicated and deposed on account of their relationship to Waldrada, and the assistance they gave her." In the *Ann. Met.* Gunther is bribed to the king's party by a promise to marry his niece (neptis), and this niece cannot be Waldrada. — "Guntharii Episcopi neptis ad regem accersitur, *ac semel*, ut aiunt, ab eo stupratur, atque cum cachinno omnium et omnium derisione ad avunculum remittitur." This insult, moreover, to Gunther is utterly irreconcilable with his faithful adhesion to the cause of Lothair and Waldrada, and makes the affair more inexplicable. — *Ann. Met. apud Bouquet*, p. 191. The *Annales Bertiniani* say that the king was bound to Waldrada by witchcraft, as it was said "*faventibus illi avunculo suo Luitprando et Vultaria, qui ob hoc maximè illi erant familiares.*" Liutprand here seems to have been her uncle. — *Apud Bouquet*, p. 79.

² A new contradiction was now inserted into the confession of Theutberga, that she was not "*idonea conjux.*"

³ According to one letter of Pope Nicolas, she was actually married "*publico festoque nuptiarum ritu celebrato, Waldradam sibi jure matrimonii sociavit.*" — *Nicol. Pap. Epist.*, Bouquet, p. 434.

It was at this juncture that the Pope interposed to protect the injured and blameless wife of Lothair. Theutberga herself, worn out with persecution, had renewed her confession, and only entreated permission to retire into a convent to bewail her sins. The first negotiations of the Pope were strangely baffled. His legates, one of them the same Radoaldus, Bishop of Porto, who had shown so much weakness or venality at Constantinople, was bribed by Lothair and the Lotharingian bishops. A third council at Metz, at which the Pope's legates were present, ratified all the decrees of the former synods. The legates, if they did not assent, made no opposition. With this decree the two Archbishops, Gunther and Theotgand, were so imprudent as to proceed in person, as the king's ambassadors, to Rome. They rushed blindly into the net; the net closed around them. Nicolas summoned a synod, and from that synod issued a lofty edict, addressed to Hincmar of Rheims and Wanilo of Rouen. The Pope condemned, in the strongest terms, the guilt of King Lothair—if king he might be called—and Gunther and Theotgand, as the abettors and accomplices in his guilt. He annulled the acts of the synod of Metz, which was hereafter to be called no synod, but a brothel of adulterers. He excommunicated and deposed Gunther and Theotgand, and all the bishops their partisans.

The pride of the high-born prelate, Gunther, broke out into fury at this unexpected affront. He hastened to the camp of the Emperor, Louis the Elder, brother of King Lothair, to whom, on the severance of the empire of Lothair I., had fallen the kingdom of Italy, with the Imperial title. The Emperor at once espoused

Pope Nicolas
interferes.

Archbishops
of Cologne
and Treves
at Rome.
Oct. 863.

the cause of the German prelate, shared in his resentment, and marched with his army upon Rome.

The Pope attempted no resistance; he summoned his clergy around him; ordered a rigid fast and perpetual litanies to God, to avert the wrath of the Emperor. The lawless soldiery entered Rome; the Emperor's guards occupied the approaches to St. Peter's; and as the clergy and people came in solemn procession, with their crosses borne before them, and chanting their sad litanies, the crosses and banners were thrown down, trampled on, and broken; the clergy, maltreated, beaten, hardly escaped with their lives. Even the great crucifix, the offering, it was believed, of the Empress Helena, which contained a portion of the true cross, was broken to pieces, and dashed into the mire. Some pious Englishmen collected the fragments with reverential care. The Pope heard that measures were in agitation to seize his person. He hastily crossed the Tiber in a boat, found his way into the church of St. Peter, and passed two days and nights without food. Heaven, in the mean time, appeared to declare in favor of the defenceless Pontiff. The man who had broken the great cross suddenly fell dead. The Emperor was seized with a fever. In the agony of his terror he sent the Empress to implore the mercy of the Pope. A female ambassador, under such circumstances, was not likely to be difficult as to the terms of reconciliation. Louis at once abandoned the cause of the bishops. Deserted by all, they retired in disgrace to France. There they still supposed themselves secure in their own power, and in the support of King Lothair. Before they left Rome they published an appeal to all Christian bishops. They complained, in the

The Emperor
Louis in
Rome.

March, 864.

language of defiance, of the insolent injustice of the Pope. He had decoyed them to Rome; he had closed the gates on them as on robbers, ignominiously arrested them,¹ condemned them without synod or canonical examination, without accuser, without witness, without discussion, without proof, without their own confession, in the absence of other metropolitan or suffragan bishops, with no common consent, of his own will, Declaration of archbishops. in his tyrannical madness. "This Lord Nicolas, who calls himself Pope, accounts himself as one of the Apostles, and makes himself Emperor, has presumed, at the instigation of our enemies, to condemn us. He will find that we are determined to resist his insanity, and make him repent of his precipitancy." They cast back his anathema in disdain, and in their turn excommunicate the Pope,² and declare that, by his arrogant self-exaltation over the whole Church, he has sequestered himself from its communion.³ They added further, that they asserted only the rights of their own order. Nicolas refused to receive this protest, upon which one of the archbishop's officers and some of his men forced their way into the church of St. Peter, beat down the guards, one of whom was killed, and laid the daring document upon the tomb believed to contain the body of St. Peter.

The archbishops retreated to their dioceses. Notwithstanding the Papal interdict, Gunther celebrated

¹ They describe their arrest: "Ibique obseratis ostiis, conspiratione more latrociniali facta, et ex clericis et laicis turba collecta et permixta, nos opprimere inter tantos violenter studuisti . . . tuo solius arbitrio ex tyrannico furore damnare nosmet voluisti."

² See this remarkable document in the *Annales Bertiniani*, A.D. 863.

³ "Contenti totius ecclesiæ communione et paternâ societate, quam tu arroganter te superexultans despicias, teque ab eâ elationis tumore indignum faciens sequestras."

divine service in his cathedral at Cologne; the more timid Theotgand abstained from his ecclesiastical functions.

But Lothair was as dastardly as lustful. Other bish-
Lothair
abandons
them. ops got round him, and urged on his weak mind all the terrors of the Papal power.¹ He did not scruple to sacrifice those prelates who, in compliance with his will, had hesitated at no injustice, and had dared to confront and to defy, to commit a kind of capital treason against the sacerdotal power. He deposed Gunther, and appointed his own son,² a youth only. Gunther was deserted on all sides; the simple and blameless Archbishop of Treves³ had bowed before the storm; the other bishops of the condemned synod of Metz hastened to make their peace with Rome; they gladly accepted the indulgence of the holy father. The Archbishop of Cologne was forbidden to approach the royal presence, avoided as a person excommunicate. He seized the treasure of his Church, and, armed with this, in all ages a powerful weapon, he hastened to Rome to unfold the iniquities of the king's proceedings against his wife.⁴ But Lothair had anticipated his revenge. He sent a bishop with the humblest protestations of repentance and submission to the Apostolic See. The Abbot Hubert, in the mean time, had

¹ This is the language of Nicolas to King Lothair: "*Ita corporis tui cedere motibus consensisti, ut relaxatis voluptatum habenis temet ipsum in lacum miserie et in lutum facis pro libitu dejecisti, ut qui positus fueras ad gubernationem populorum, effectus sis ruina multorum.*" — *Ad Lothair, Reg.*, Oct. 863.

² Hugo never obtained actual possession. Some time after the see was intrusted to the care of Hilduin, brother of Gunther, who dispensed the revenues, though the see was held to be vacant. — *Ann. Bertin.*, p. 92.

³ "*Simplicissimus ac innocentissimus vir.*" — *Annal. Bertin.*

⁴ "*Falsa de more suo.*" — *Ann. Bertin.*, p. 86.

been killed by his own retainers. Theutberga, who had lived under the guardianship of her brother, took refuge in the dominions of Charles the Bald. The alarm of Lothair increased; he suspected his uncles, Charles and Louis, of a design to seize and share his kingdom, the Pope of connivance, if not of more than connivance, in their hostile plans.

Nicolas was not content with his triumph over the feeble Lothair, and the daring but indiscreet bishops who had espoused his cause. He aspired to dictate to the other more powerful Carlovingian kings, to Charles and to Louis; and even Hincmar, ^{Hincmar of Rheims.} the Archbishop of Rheims, the most learned, political, and powerful ecclesiastic in France,¹ must bow before his authority. He sent his legate, Arsenius, into France with letters to the sovereigns so haughty and imperious as to shock even the submissive spirit of those times.² He rebukes them with the tone of a master, or rather openly declares that he speaks with the authority of God, from actual divine inspiration, when he reproaches them for presuming to prohibit the bishops of their realms from obeying the papal summons to a synod at Rome.³ He will not admit the excuse of Charles the Bald that the greater part of the bishops were watching

¹ Sismondi states boldly that Hincmar was the sole ruler of France.

² "Nicolaus Papa Arsenium . . . cum epistolis ad Hludovicum et Carolum fratres . . . non cum Apostolicâ mansuetudine, et solitâ honorabilitate sicut Episcopi Romani consueverant Reges in suis epistolis honorare, sed cum malitiosâ interminatione." — Pagi (sub ann. 865) rebukes the author of the *Ann. Bertin.*, even Hincmar himself, perhaps the author, whose sentiments at all events the book expresses, for this misrepresentation. He appeals to the more courteous letter to Charles. But the epistle to the two brothers fully bears out the charge. April 22, 865.

³ "Unde si vos fortasse aliter dicitis, nos illud dicimus, quod divinitus revelatur." He thus claims divine authority for Roman synods: "Nos consensu illorum, revelante Domino, quæ decernenda sunt decerneremus."

day and night against the descents of the Norman pirates. He reproves this secular occupation of the bishops. If towards these kings he preserves some show of respect, of Lothair he speaks with unmitigated contempt. His uncles had urged Lothair to go on a suppliant pilgrimage to Rome; Lothair had expressed his earnest desire to do so. The Pope sternly interdicts his journey, declaring that the holy Roman Church would not receive, but despise, and reject, such men.¹ He commands the king, without subterfuge or evasion, to receive back his wife; even if Theutberga should prefer the state of separation, she is to be compelled to return to her husband's bed. "But if Lothair, whom, to prevent war and bloodshed, we have still treated with some leniency, shall lift up his horn, and disobey your admonitions and ours, the affair must take its course."

The letter of the Pope to the bishops advances still higher pretensions; the object, indeed, is noble and Christian. He commands them to maintain that peace which had been sworn by the three royal brethren, to prevent the shedding of Christian blood. But he asserts the coronation of the Emperor to be a grant of the Imperial power by the Roman See. The sword was given to the Emperor by the Vicar of St. Peter, yet to be employed against infidels, not against his fellow Christians. The empire descended to Louis by hereditary right, but was confirmed by the authority of the Apostolic See.²

¹ "Cui interdiximus, et omnino interdicimus, ut iter talis qualis nunc est non arripiat, eo quod sancta Ecclesia Romana tales respuat et contemnat."

² "Macheræ usum, quam primum a Petri principis Apostolorum vicario, contra infideles accepit, non cogatur in Christi fideles convertere. . . . Regna sibi per hæreditarium jus devoluta, et sedis Apostolicæ auctoritate firmata." — *Epist. ad Episcop. Gall. apud Bouquet, p. 404.*

The legate "from the side" of the Pope began now to appear as a dictator to the Northern kings. Arsenius was not the first who bore this title ; ^{Papal legates.} but he asserted its pride and power with yet almost unprecedented vigor. The legate first appeared at Frankfort, and delivered his message to the Emperor Louis ; thence he passed to the court of Lothair.¹ He threatened the king with immediate excommunication if he did not dismiss the concubine Waldrada, and receive his repudiated queen. He then betook himself to Attigny, the residence of Charles the Bald. He peremptorily commanded the restoration of the Bishop Rothrad, who had been canonically, as it was asserted, deposed by Hincmar his metropolitan, and was now irregularly, without inquiry or examination, replaced by the arbitrary mandate of the Pope.² Hincmar murmured and obeyed ; the king acquiesced in the papal de- ^{A.D. 865.} cree, trembling at the menaced anathema.

From Attigny, Arsenius conducted Theutberga to the court of her husband. A solemn oath was dictated by the legate, and sworn on the ^{Arsenius crowns Lothair and Theutberga.} Gospels by six counts and six vassals, in the name of Lothair, that he would receive Theutberga as his lawful wife, and restore her fully to her ^{A.D. 865.} conjugal rights. Four archbishops and four bishops besides the legate, were present at the ceremony. She was then publicly delivered to her husband, under the most awful denunciations of excommunication and con-

¹ "Apud Gandulfi villam." — Ann. Bertin.

² The Annales Bertin. are supposed to express the sentiments of Hincmar. "Et Rothradum canonice a quinque provinciarum episcopis dejectum, et a Nicolao papâ non regulariter, sed potentialiter restitutum." — P. 89.

demnation to everlasting fire,¹ if he did not fulfil the solemn compact. Lothair and Theutberga were then crowned king and queen of Lorraine.

Arsenius found the papal fulminations weapons too useful and effective to be confined to royal offenders. A terrible excommunication of unusual violence was launched against certain plunderers who, some years before, had robbed him of a large sum of money, unless they made immediate restitution. Another was issued against Ingeltruda, the wife of Count Boso, who had left her husband, and was leading a wandering and disreputable life.²

Waldrada had been delivered up to Arsenius to be conducted to Rome that she might undergo the proper penance; but Arsenius was persuaded by some powerful influence, not impossibly by bribery (for he was a man of notorious rapacity), to allow her, after she had reached Parma, to return to France.³ Two years afterwards the two excommunicated archbishops, beguiled with false hopes of restoration, were persuaded to go to Rome; though on a former journey they had been sternly repelled by the Pope. The aged archbishop of Treves died there; Gunther of Cologne hardly escaped with his life. Nicolas persisted to the

¹ "Si in omnibus, ut superius legitur, non observaverit atque impleverit, non solum in præsente vitâ sed etiam in æterno Dei terribili judicio, eum B. Petro principi Apostolorum redditurum rationem et ab ipso æternaliter in eodem judicio damnandum, et igni perpetuo concremandum." — Ann. Bertin., p. 90.

² The Ann. Bertin. mention this: "Epistolam Nicolai Papæ plenam terribilibus et a modestiâ sedis Apostolicæ hactenus inauditis maledictionibus."

³ Nicolas wrote to the bishops to treat Waldrada as an excommunicated person, for her contumacy in refusing to go to Rome, and her suspicious intrigues against the queen. — Epist. xxviii., Bouquet, 419.

end in his resistance to the intercession of the emperor Louis, and of many German bishops. He treated these men as open favorers of adultery ; as the authors and contrivers of all this foul and revolting iniquity.¹ The inexorable Pope saw one die, the other on the brink of the grave, without relaxing his unforgiving severity.

Rumors soon reached the vigilant Pontiff that the reconciliation of Lothair with his wife was but false and seeming. He was suspected of continuing secret intercourse with Waldrada ; although Adventius, the Bishop of Metz, protested that all the king's conversation with Waldrada (Waldrada, now under public sentence of excommunication)² was pure,³ and that he treated his wife with the utmost respect, that he appeared with her in church, and was reported to admit her to his bed.⁴ But this was soon belied by an earnest supplication to the Pope from the unhappy queen to be released from her miserable marriage. She asserted the previous wedlock of Lothair with Waldrada, her own unfitness, from some secret malady, for the conjugal state. She entreated to be permitted to come to Rome, that she might communicate with the Pope. Nicolas replied in a tone of stern commiseration. He refused to receive a confession extorted manifestly by force. Even were

¹ Compare his later letters, where he speaks of the "fœtida gesta." His usual name for Waldrada is *mœcha*.

² Waldrada was excommunicated Feb. 2, 866.

³ Thus writes Adventius: "Et nos veriore experientiâ investigare volumus, in nullo prorsus colloquio per tactum, vel visum illâ (Waldradâ) fieri voluit."

⁴ "Theutbergam Reginam noster Senior ad præsens ita tractare cernitur, sicut rex conjunctam sibi debet tractare reginam, videlicet ad divinum officium pariter honorificè comitantem, et in mensâ regiâ simul convivantem, atque, ut relatio innuit, conjugalibus habitibus debitum solvere hilariter prætendit." — Apud Bouquet, p. 595.

she to die, the Church would never permit Lothair to marry the adulteress Waldrada. The guilty king, by the example of his adultery, had plunged thousands into the chaos of perdition ; what wonder if she should force others to commit perjury ? He positively forbade her journey to Rome, and exhorted her to endure glorious martyrdom in the cause of righteousness. Oct. 30, 867. The wretched Theutberga was, in the mean time, exposed to every insult and contumely. Lothair had at one time accused her of adultery, and proposed that she should vindicate her honor by wager of battle. Jan. 867. Nicolas prohibited this appeal to arms ; and in a letter to Lothair himself, contempt, most profound and well deserved, mingles with his indignant expostulations. Lothair was at length driven, by the steadfast severity of the Pope, from every subterfuge. He was preparing to send his wife to Rome, to appear himself before the judgment-seat, and even to yield up his beloved Waldrada to the penitential discipline of the Church. Before his descent into Italy he endeavored, by the intercession of his uncle, the Emperor Louis, to obtain for his son by Waldrada the promise of Alsace. For this end he still lingered in France ; but Nicolas did not live to enjoy his perfect triumph ; he died Nov. A.D. 867. in November, A.D. 867 — a Pontiff who, if he advanced no absolutely unexampled pretensions to supremacy in behalf of the Roman See, yet, by the favorable juncture and auspicious circumstances which he seized to assert and maintain that authority, did more than all his predecessors to strengthen and confirm it. During all his conflicts in the West with the royal and with the episcopal power, the moral and religious sympathies of mankind could not

Death of
Nicolas I.

Nov. A.D. 867.

His charac-
ter.

but be on his side. If his language was occasionally more violent, even contemptuous, than became the moderation which, up to this time, had mitigated the papal decrees, he might plead lofty and righteous indignation: if he interfered with domestic relations, it was in defence of the innocent and defenceless, and in vindication of the sanctity of marriage: if he treated kings with scorn, it was because they had become contemptible for their weakness or their vices: if he interfered with episcopal or metropolitan jurisdiction, the inferior clergy, even bishops, would be pleased to have a remote, and possibly disinterested tribunal, to which they might appeal from prelates, chosen only from aristocratic connections, barbarians in occupation and in ferocity:¹ if he was inexorable to transgressors, it was to those of the highest order, prelates who had lent themselves to injustice and iniquity, and had defied his power: if he annulled councils, those councils had already been condemned for their injustice, had deserved the reproachful appellation with which they were branded by the Pope, with all who had any innate or unperverted sentiment of justice and purity. Hence the presumptuous usurpation even of divine power, so long as it was thus beneficently used, awed, confounded all, and offended few. Men took no alarm at the arrogance which befriended them against the oppressor and the tyrant.

The impression left by Nicolas I. on his times may be estimated by the words of a later writer. "Since the days of Gregory I. to our time sat no high-priest on the throne of St. Peter to be compared to Nicolas. He

¹ Giraud, *Droit Romain en France pendant le Moyen Age*, vol. i.

tamed kings and tyrants, and ruled the world like a sovereign: to holy bishops and clergy he was mild and gentle; to the wicked and unconverted a terror; so that we might truly say a new Elias arose in him.”¹

But this vast moral advancement of the popedom was not all which the Roman See owes to Nicolas I.; she owes the questionable boon of the recognition of the False Decretals as the law of the Church.

Nicolas I. not only saw during his pontificate the famous False Decretals take their place in the jurisprudence of Latin Christendom; if he did not promulgate, he assumed them as authentic documents; he gave them the weight of the papal sanction; and with their aid prostrated at his feet the one great Transalpine prelate who could still maintain the independence of the Teutonic Church, Hincmar Archbishop of Rheims.

Up to this period the Decretals, the letters or edicts of the Bishops of Rome, according to the authorized or common collection of Dionysius, commenced with Pope Siricius, towards the close of the fourth century. To the collection of Dionysius was added that of the authentic councils, which bore the name of Isidore of Seville. On a sudden was promulgated, unannounced, without preparation, not absolutely unquestioned, but apparently overawing at once all doubt, a new Code, which to the former authentic documents added fifty-nine letters and decrees of the twenty oldest Popes from Clement to Melchiades, and the donation of Constantine; and in the third part, among the decrees of the Popes and of the councils from Silvester to Gregory II., thirty-nine false decrees, and the acts of several unauthentic coun-

¹ Regin. Chron. ad ann. 698. Pertz, i. 579.

cils.¹ In this vast manual of sacerdotal Christianity the Popes appear from the first the parents, guardians, legislators of the faith throughout the world. Contents.

The False Decretals do not merely assert the supremacy of the Popes — the dignity and privileges of the Bishop of Rome — they comprehend the whole dogmatic system and discipline of the Church, the whole hierarchy from the highest to the lowest degree, their sanctity, and immunities, their persecutions, their disputes, their right of appeal to Rome. They are full and minute on Church property, on its usurpation and spoliation; on ordinations; on the sacraments, on baptism, confirmation, marriage, the Eucharist; on fasts and festivals; the discovery of the cross, the discovery of the reliques of the Apostles; on the chrism, holy water, consecration of churches, blessing of the fruits of the field; on the sacred vessels and habiliments. Personal incidents are not wanting to give life and reality to the fiction. The

¹ Nicolas of Cusa, and Turrecremata, before the Reformation, had doubted, as far as they dared to doubt. The Magdeburg centuriators, after them Blondel exposed the fraud with unanswerable arguments. The Jesuit, La Torre, attempted a feeble defence: he was scourged into obscurity by Blondel. Since that time there has been hardly a murmur of defence. There is an excellent brief (Roman Catholic) summary of the whole question in Walter (*Kirchen Recht*, pp. 155 et seqq.). Mohler (*Schriften*) softens the fiction into poetry; he is too ingenious to be convincing; and wishes to convince, rather than succeeds, as it appears to me, in convincing himself. I know only from other writers what seems the masterly investigation of Knust. Gfrörer, in his *History of the Church* and in a dissertation (Freiburg, 1848), displays more than his usual industry and sagacity, but I think is somewhat too narrow and partial (compare Walter, *Kirchen Recht*, 158) in his hypothesis, that the sole, if not the sole, the almost exclusive design of the Decretals was to lower the power of the metropolitans. Indeed, in his later and valuable work, *Die Karolinger* (Freiburg, 1848), he seems to me to have taken a wider range, to have summed up the whole question with more perfect mastery. Gfrörer's general failing, in my judgment, is drawing wide and peremptory conclusions from scanty and doubtful evidence: he is too much enamoured of his own very great ingenuity.

whole is composed with an air of profound piety and reverence; a specious purity, and occasionally beauty, in the moral and religious tone. There are many axioms of seemingly sincere and vital religion. But for the too manifest design, the aggrandizement of the See of Rome and the aggrandizement of the whole clergy in subordination to the See of Rome; but for the monstrous ignorance of history, which betrays itself in glaring anachronisms, and in the utter confusion of the order of events and the lives of distinguished men—the former awakening keen and jealous suspicion, the latter making the detection of the spuriousness of the whole easy, clear, irrefragable;—the False Decretals might still have maintained their place in ecclesiastical history. They are now given up by all; not a voice is raised in their favor; the utmost that is done by those who cannot suppress all regret at their explosion, is to palliate the guilt of the forger, to call in question or to weaken the influence which they had in their own day, and throughout the later history of Christianity.

The author or authors of this most audacious and Authorship. elaborate of pious frauds are unknown; the date and place of its compilation are driven into such narrow limits that they may be determined within a few years, and within a very circumscribed region. The False Decretals came not from Rome;¹ the time of their arrival at Rome, after they were known beyond the Alps, appears almost certain. In one year Nicolas I. is apparently ignorant of their existence, the next he speaks of them with full knowledge. They contain words manifestly used at the Council of Paris, A.D. 829,

¹ Eichhorn, almost alone, maintains their Roman origin. — Compare also Luden. *Geschichte*, v. p. 468, *et seqq.*

consequently are of later date; they were known to the Levite Benedict of Metz,¹ who composed a supplement to the collection of capitularies by Adgesil, between A.D. 840–847. The city of Metz is designated with nearly equal certainty as the place in which, if not actually composed, they were first promulgated as the canon law of Christendom.

The state of affairs in the divided and distracted empire might seem almost to call for, almost to justify, this desperate effort to strengthen the ecclesiastical power. All the lower clergy, including some of the bishops, were groaning, just at this time, under heavy oppression. By the constitution of Charlemagne, which survived under Louis the Pious, and, so long as the empire maintained its unity, asserted the independence of the Transalpine hierarchy of all but the temporal sovereign, the clergy were under strict subordination to the bishop, the bishop to the metropolitan, the metropolitan only to the Emperor. Conflicting Popes, or Popes in conflict with Italian enemies, or with their own subjects, had reduced the papacy to vassalage under the empire. Conflicting kings, on the division of the realm of Charlemagne, had not yet, but were soon about to submit the empire to the Roman supremacy. All at present was anarchy. The Germans and the French were drawing asunder into separate rival nations; the sons of Louis were waging an endless, implacable strife. Almost every year, less than every decade of years, beheld a new partition of the empire; kingdoms rose and fell, took new boundaries, acknowledged new sover-

¹ Walter appears to think Benedict the author of the work.

eigns ; no government was strong enough to maintain the law ; might was the only law.¹

The hierarchy, if not the whole clergy, had taken the lead in the disruption of the unity of the empire ; they had abased the throne of Louis ; they were for a short disastrous period now the victims of that abasement. Their wealth was their danger. They had become secular princes, they had become nobles, they had become vast landed proprietors. But during the civil wars it was not the persuasive voice, but the strong arm, which had authority ; the mitre must bow before the helmet, the crosier before the sword. Not only the domains, the persons of the clergy had lost their sanctity. The persecution and oppression of the Church and the clergy had reached a height unknown in former times. Thus writes Bishop Agobard of Lyons : “ No condition of men, whether free or unfree, is so insecure in the possession of his property as the priest ; no one can foresee how many days he may be master of his church, of his house. Not only the estates of the Church, the churches themselves are sold.” The Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle (A.D. 836) protested against the contempt into which the clergy had fallen with the ungodly laity. They wrote in bitter remonstrance to King Pepin, the son of Louis, — “ There are people who boldly say, ‘ Where hath God ordained that the goods of which the priests claim possession are consecrated to him ? The whole earth is the Lord’s ; has he not created it for the good of all mankind ? ’ ”² The metropolitans alone

¹ This is in no way inconsistent with the immense and steady advance of the clergy in power and wealth ; it was a temporary depression, remedied, as will soon appear, from other sources of vigor and energy.

² Mansi sub ann. 836.

(we have seen those of the Rhine haughty to all beneath them, basely subservient to the wickedness of their kings) stood above the tumult, themselves if not tyrants or instruments of royal tyranny, either trampling on the inferior clergy, or, at least, not protecting them from being trampled on or plundered by others.

It might occur to the most religious, that for the sake of religion ; it might occur to those to whom the dignity and interest of the sacerdotal order were their religion, that some effort must be made to reinvest the clergy in their imperilled sanctity. There must be some appeal against this secular, this ecclesiastical tyranny : and whither should appeal be ? It could not be to the Scriptures, to the Gospel. It must be to ancient and venerable tradition, to the unrepealed, irrevocable law of the Church ; to remote and awful Rome. Rome must be proclaimed in an unusual, more emphatic manner, the eternal, immemorial court of appeal. The tradition must not rest on the comparatively recent names of Leo the Great, of Innocent the Great, of Siricius, or the right of appeal depend on the decree of the Council of Sardica. It must come down from the successors of St. Peter himself in unbroken succession. The whole clergy must have a perpetual, indefeasible sanctity of the same antiquity.

So may the idea of this, to us it seems, monstrous fiction have dawned upon its author ; himself may have implicitly believed that he asserted no prerogative for Rome which Rome herself had not claimed, which he did not think to be her right. It is even now asserted, perhaps can hardly be disproved, that the False Decretals advanced no pretensions in favor of the See of Rome which had not been heard before in some vague and

indefinite, but not therefore less significant, language. The boldness of the act was in the new authority in which it arrayed these pretensions. The author may have thought that in renewing the power, while he by no means lost sight of the holiness of the clergy, he was embarked in a hallowed cause. In some respects he shows skill at least as consummate as might be expected in that age. There was no great fear of detection in a fiction so advantageous to those who could alone expose it, the clergy, in an age which, for instance, received the life of St. Denys, written by the Abbot Hilduin of that monastery, and the ecclesiastical counsellor of the emperor, as identified with Dionysius the Areopagite; a legend almost of unparalleled extravagance, but which became at once accredited hagiology. The new code was enshrined, as it were, in a framework of deeply religious thought and language; it was introduced under the venerated name of Isidore of Seville (it was rumored to have been brought from Spain by Riculf, Archbishop of Metz); it was thus attached to the authentic work of Isidore, which had long enjoyed undisputed authority. Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, as the most powerful, so, perhaps, the most learned Transalpine ecclesiastic, who might at once have exposed the fiction, which he could hardly but know to be a fiction, coöperated more than any one else to establish its authority. So long as he supposed it to advance or confirm his own power, he suppressed all intrusive doubts; he discovered too late that it was a trap (a mousetrap is his own undignified word) to catch unwary metropolitans.¹ Hincmar was caught, beyond all hope of es-

¹ "Circumposita omnibus metropolitans muscipula." — Opp. ii. 413.

cape. In the appeal of Rothrad, Bishop of Soissons, against Hincmar, metropolitan of Rheims, Pope Nicolas I. at first alleges no word of the new Decretals in favor of his right of appeal; he seemingly knows no older authority than that of Innocent, Leo, Siricius, and the Council of Sardica.¹ The next year not merely is he fully master of the pseudo-Isidorian documents, but he taunts Hincmar with now calling in question, when it makes against him, authority which he was ready to acknowledge in confirmation of his own power. Hincmar is forced to the humiliation of submission. Rothrad, deposed by Hincmar, deposed by the Council of Senlis, is reinstated in his see.²

This immediate, if somewhat cautious, adoption of the fiction, unquestionably not the forgery, by Pope Nicolas, appears to me less capable of ^{Adoption at Rome.} charitable palliation than the original invention. It was, in truth, a strong temptation. But in Rome, where such documents had never been heard of, it is difficult to imagine by what arguments a man, not unlearned, could convince himself, or believe that he could convince himself, of their authenticity. Here was a long, continuous, unbroken series of letters, an accumulated mass of decrees of councils, of which the archives of Rome could show no vestige, of which the traditions of Rome were altogether silent: yet is there no holy indignation at fraud, no lofty reproof of those who dared to seat themselves in the pontifical chair and speak in

¹ Compare back p. 52.

² This fact appears to me irresistibly proved by Gfrörer in his dissertation. See also *Die Karolinger*, i. p. 479 et seqq. Gfrörer seems to infer that they were carried to Rome from beyond the Alps by Rothrad of Soissons.

the names of Pope after Pope. There is a deliberate, artful vindication of their authority. Reasons are alleged from which it is impossible to suppose that Nicolas himself believed their validity, on account of their acknowledged absence from the Roman archives. Nor did the successors of Nicolas betray any greater scruple in strengthening themselves by this welcome, and therefore only, unsuspecting aid. It is impossible to deny that, at least by citing without reserve or hesitation, the Roman pontiffs gave their deliberate sanction to this great historic fraud.¹

Nor must be overlooked, perhaps the more important result of the acceptance of the pseudo-Isidorian statutes as the universal, immemorial, irrevocable law of Christendom. It established the great principle which Nicolas I. had before announced, of the sole legislative power of the Pope.² Every one of these papal epistles was a canon of the Church; every future bull therefore rested on the same irrefragable authority, commanded the same implicit obedience. The Papacy became a legislative as well as an administrative authority. Infallibility was the next inevitable step, if infallibility was not already in the power asserted to have been bestowed by the Lord on St. Peter, by St. Peter handed down in unbroken descent, and in a plenitude which could not be restricted or limited, to the latest of his successors.

¹ Nicolai Epist. ad Episcopos Galliae, Mansi, xv. 693.

² Nicolai I. Epist. ad Michaellem Imperatorem, apud Labbe, sub ann. 865.

CHAPTER V.

HADRIAN II. HINCMAR OF RHEIMS.

NICOLAS was succeeded by Hadrian II., a rigid and lofty churchman, who, though his policy at first appeared doubtful,¹ resolutely maintained, Hadrian II. Nov. 867. but not with equal judgment and success, the principles of his predecessor. Hadrian (he was now seventy-five years old) had been married before he became a priest; his wife was still living; and a tragic event, in which the son of another prelate, Arsenius, the late legate in France, was involved, might suggest to the popular mind that the more absolutely the higher clergy were secluded from all domestic ties the better.

Though the daughter of Hadrian was betrothed to another, she was carried off and married by Eleutherius, the son of Arsenius. Arsenius, implicated no doubt in the affair, fled with all his treasures to the court of the Emperor Louis. These treasures he placed in the hands of the Empress Ingeltruda, probably to secure the imperial protection for his son. He died Death of Arsenius the legate. suddenly, and so great was the hatred against him, that he was said to have been carried off while conversing freely with devils;² at all events, he died

¹ Vit. Hadriani, c. 15.

² "Ut dicebatur, cum dæmonibus confabulans, sine communione abivit in suum locum." — Ann. Bertin. p. 99.

without the sacrament, and of his eternal damnation no one had any doubt. Hadrian sent a mission to the Emperor to demand that Eleutherius should be judged by the Roman law for the abduction of his daughter.

Oct. 12,
A.D. 868. Eleutherius in revenge, or despairing of the issue, murdered both his wife and her mother, the wife of the Pope.¹ By the Emperor's command he suffered the penalty of his crimes.

Hadrian, whether softened by these domestic calamities, appeared at first to take a milder course than Pope Nicolas in the affair of Lothair. He sent back, indeed, Theutberga, who had arrived at Rome to implore the dissolution of the marriage on the plea of her own personal infirmity: but, at the intercession of the Emperor Louis, he took off the ban of excommunication from Waldrada, and restored her to the communion of the Church.

By this lenity he might seem to lure King Lothair to the last act of submission. The King of
A.D. 868,
Feb. 12. Lorraine arrived in Italy. The Pope seemed to yield to the influence of Louis and the Empress Engelberga; at least he accepted the munificent presents of the king.

From Monte Casino, where they first met, Lothair followed the Pope to Rome. There, instead
Lothair at
Rome.
A.D. 869.
July 1-11. of being received as a king, and as one reconciled with the See of Rome, when he entered the church all was silent and vacant; not one

¹ Hincmari Ann. "Stephaniam uxorem ipsius pontificis et ejus filiam, quam sibi rapuit, interfecit." Anastasius the Librarian (not the biographer of the popes), the brother of Arsenius, was concerned, as was supposed, in this horrible business. The excommunication, already issued against him, was confirmed and repeated by Hadrian.

of the clergy appeared : he retired to a neighboring chamber, which was not even swept for his reception. The next day was Sunday, and he hoped to hear the mass chanted before him. The Pope refused him this honor. He dined, however, the next day with the Pope, and an interchange of presents took place.¹

At length Hadrian consented to admit him to the communion. Towards the close of the holy office, holding the body and blood of Christ in his hands, the Pope thus addressed the king : "If thou avouchest thyself innocent of the crime of adultery, for which thou hast been excommunicated by the Lord Nicolas, and art resolved never again to have unlawful intercourse with the harlot Waldrada, draw near in faith, and receive this sacrament for the remission of thy sins. But if thou thinkest in thy heart to return to wallow in adultery, beware of receiving it, lest thou provoke the terrible judgment of God." The king shuddered, but did not draw back. Under a like adjuration, that they were not consentient to the guilt of the king with Waldrada, he administered the rite to the attendants on Lothair. Even Gunther, the contumacious Archbishop of Cologne, having drained to the dregs the cup of humiliation, was admitted to lay communion.²

What was the terror of Western Christendom when it became known that every one of these men had perished before the end of the year ! A pestilence, so common among northern armies in Italy, especially at Rome, broke out. But a few, and those only, it is said, who had avoided that fatal communion, survived.

¹ The Ann. Bertin. and Ann. Met. do not quite agree in the arrangement of these events. This scene is placed by the former at Monte Cassino, sub ann. 869.

² This is the most probable time for the reconciliation of Gunther.

Aug. 8. Lothair himself was seized with the fever at Lucca, with difficulty reached Placentia, and there expired.

Pope Hadrian seized the occasion of the contest for the kingdom of Lothair to advance still more daring and unprecedented pretensions. But the world was not yet ripe for this broad and naked assertion of secular power by the Pope, his claim to interfere in the disposal of kingdoms. Directly he left the strong ground of moral and religious authority, from which his predecessor Nicolas had commanded the world, he encountered insurmountable resistance. With all that remained of just and generous sympathy on their side Popes might intermeddle in the domestic relations of kings; they were not permitted as yet to touch the question of royal succession or inheritance. The royal and the episcopal power had quailed before Nicolas; the fulminations of Hadrian were treated with contempt or indifference: and Hincmar of Rheims in this quarrel with Hadrian regained that independence and ascendancy which had been obscured by his temporary submission to Nicolas.

Charles the Bald his uncle, the son of Louis the Pious and the Empress Judith, seized at once the vacant dominions of Lothair, though the undoubted inheritance of the Emperor Louis II., as brother to the childless deceased sovereign. Charles was crowned at Metz; he rested his claim on the election of the people, and on his coronation by the bishops of the realm.¹ The friendship of Louis the Emperor and King of Italy, then engaged in a success-

Hadrian interferes in the disposal of Lothair's kingdom.

It is seized by Charles the Bald. June 28, 870.

¹ Hadriani Epist. ad Ludovic. German. apud Bouquet, p. 442.

ful war against the Saracens of Bari, was of greater importance to the Pope than that of Charles, now gathering almost the whole of the Transalpine empire under his sway. He espoused the claims of Louis with headlong ardor. The Emperor, he wrote significantly to the elder uncle Louis the Germanic, was warring, not like some other kings, against Christians, but against the sons of Belial, the enemies of the Christian faith; and he warned Louis against aggression on dominions which were not his own. "The hand of the Apostolic See will be strong on the side of this most pious Emperor; and the great Dispenser of battles, through the intercession of the chief of the apostles, will insure triumph."¹

In a letter to the nobles of the kingdom of Lorraine, he threatened with excommunication all who, June 28, 870. disregarding the mandates of the Apostolic Hadrian re- See, should oppose the claims of his ally the Emperor. sists in vain. To the nobles of Charles's kingdom he declared, that any one who should assist in his diabolic usurpation, would fall under anathema, and be given up to the companionship of the devil. He summoned the bishops, on their allegiance to the Apostolic See, to dissuade Charles from his ambitious designs. By concurring in such detestable deeds they were preparing him for hell.² To Charles himself he wrote two letters; one before the invasion, reprehending him for refusing to receive the papal legates; the second after it, threatening him with interdict, and accusing him of perjury for violating, as he said, the treaty of Verdun.

¹ See the account of this campaign, and one for the imprisonment of the Emperor by the Duke of Benevento, in Erchempert, c. 34, 35; Pertz, iii. 252.

² "Et illi tam detestabilia faciendo . . . gehennam paratis." — Hadrian. ad Episcop. Gall. Ibid.

Hincmar had been specially summoned to break off all communion with the king, if he did not abandon the cause of Charles. Hincmar's answer shows that the doctrine of Wala, as to the inviolability of ecclesiastical fiefs, was not respected by such kings: "Should I do so, I should soon have to chant by myself in my choir, stripped of all my possessions and vassals."¹

But the king, the nobles, and the bishops pursued their course — the king of ambition, the rest of obsequious obedience — without regarding the denunciations of Hadrian. Hincmar, the Archbishop of Rheims, threw his preponderating weight into the scale in favor of the independence and consolidation of France and its absolute severance from the kingdom of Italy, which now seemed associated with the Empire. He wrote a grave, solemn, and argumentative remonstrance to the Pope. He refused to withdraw, as commanded by Hadrian, from the court of Charles. He embodied in his own language that of Charles and his partisans.² "You," said the King and nobles to the bishops, "contribute your prayers only against the Normans and other invaders; if you would have the support of our army as we of your prayers, demand of the Apostolic father that, as he cannot be both king and bishop, and as his predecessors ruled the Church, which is their own, not the state, which is the king's, he impose not on us a distant king, who cannot defend us against the sudden and frequent attacks of the pagans, nor command us Franks to be slaves. His ancestors laid not their yoke on our ancestors, nor will we bear

¹ "Quoniam, si ex sententiâ vestrâ agerem, ad altare meæ ecclesiæ cantare possem, de rebus autem et facultatibus et hominibus nullam amplius haberem potestatem." — Hincm. Oper. ii. 697.

² Hincmar, Oper. ii. p. 689.

it, for it is written in the Scriptures, that we should fight for our liberty and our inheritance to the death.”¹ The only enemy or rival whom Charles feared was his brother, Louis the Germanic ; but a share in the spoil averted his enmity. Notwithstanding the interdict of the Pope, and the claims of the Emperor, the Kings of France and Germany quietly divided the dominions of their nephew. This strife was hardly over when Hadrian interposed in another affair, relating to the family of Charles the Bald ; in revenge, it might be, for the contempt of his former mandates. Now he asserted his supremacy even over parental authority, though recognized and confirmed by the ecclesiastical dignitaries of the realm. It is a lawless and cruel history, showing at once the barbarous state of the times, the ambition and inhumanity too prevalent even among the clergy.

Carloman was the fourth and youngest son of Charles the Bald. The Church had already become a provision for the younger sons of kings, who, besides this, supposed that they were propitiating Heaven by the consecration of some of their family to the service of God. Charles the Bald made two such offerings. Lothair, who was lame, was forced to become a monk, and as Abbot of Moutier St. Jean and of St. Germain d’Auxerre, maintained the decency of his station till his death. But Carloman was less suited for the cloister. Though Abbot of St. Médard, in Soissons, he was permitted to indulge his warlike inclinations in a campaign against the Normans, with Solomon, A.D. 866.

King of Brittany. Carloman gained no great glory in this expedition, but imbibed a passion for a restless and adventurous life, unbecoming a monk. Yet abbacies

¹ P. 695.

were heaped upon him;¹ when suddenly he was arrested on a charge of conspiring against his father, stripped of all his benefices, and thrown into prison at Senlis. During the same year he was released from prison; but immediately fled into the Belgic country, raised a band of desperate robbers, and committed frightful ravages over the whole district. The king had no forces at hand to repress these outrages; he had recourse to the bishops, who, as Carloman had received deacon's orders, were urged to interpose their authority. The bandit's companions were excommunicated, and condemned, if they should be taken, to death. Carloman himself, having deceived his father by the promise of surrender, appeared again at the head of his robbers in Lorraine, ravaged the country around Toul, and crossed the mountains (the Vosges) into Burgundy. The bishops were preparing to take the extreme measure of degradation against the apostate ecclesiastic and unnatural son. To their amazement, Carloman having made a secret appeal to the Pope, letters from Hadrian July 13, 871. appeared, espousing the cause of the robber and rebel in terms of unprecedented vehemence. Resentment for the disobedience of Charles, in the seizure of Lothair's dominions, was almost the avowed cause of this extraordinary step. "Not only, O king, hast thou usurped the realm of others, but, surpassing the wild beasts in cruelty, thou hast not in thy rage respected thine own entrails, thy son Carloman. Like the ostrich, as we read in the holy book of Job, thou hast hardened thine heart to thy son, as though he were not thy son. Thou hast not only deprived him of his father's favor, and of all his benefices, but thou hast

¹ "Plurimorum monasteriorum pater reputatus." — Ann. Bertin.

banished him from thy kingdom, and, what is more impious, endeavored to procure his excommunication. But Carloman has appealed to the Apostolic See, and by the Apostolic authority we command thee to refrain from thy cruelty, and exhort thee, not, contrary to the apostle's admonition, to provoke thy children to wrath. Restore him then to thy favor ; receive him as thy son with parental affection ; reinstate him in his honors and his benefices, at least, till our legates arrive, who, by their authority, with due respect to the honor of both, may dispose and order all things. Heap not sin on sin ; forswear thy usurpations, and thy avarice ; and showing how thou hast profited by correction, seek with thy whole heart the pardon of the Church ; strive to the end lest thou perish everlastingly. The term of thy crimes will be that of our rebuke, and by God's assistance thou wilt reach the end of thy guilt and thy punishment."

Hadrian at the same time addressed the nobles of France and Lorraine to forbid them to take up arms against Carloman ; and the bishops, prohibiting his excommunication. But the clergy of France made common cause with the king, above all Hincmar of Rheims, himself involved in inevitable strife with the Pope. If the king had a rebellious son and subject, supported by the Pope, Hincmar had a contumacious nephew and suffragan, who appealed to the Pope and defied the authority of his uncle and metropolitan. How far common interests had led to any secret understanding between these two rebels against the royal and archiepiscopal authority is not clear ; but Hincmar, Bishop of Laon, alone of the Frankish clergy, refused to subscribe to the act of degradation against Hincmar of Laon.

Carloman. Hincmar of Laon must be made to pass rapidly over the scene. This turbulent nephew of Archbishop Hincmar, who bore the same name, had been advanced by misjudging nepotism in early youth to the See of Laon.¹ His first acts were acts of rebellion and contumacy against the metropolitan authority of his uncle. He had come into collision on an affair of property with the temporal power, and given offence to King Charles the Bald. He was summoned before a secular tribunal, deprived of a rich abbey: even the revenues of his see were sequestered. The nepotism of the elder Hincmar woke again, and entered into alliance with his lofty Churchmanship. He rebuked the unhallowed conduct of the king, who had presumed to lay his profane hands on a bishop, and to adjudge property claimed by the Church. He quoted against the king the irrefragable authority of passages from the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals.² Hincmar of Laon, after an apology not too humble, was reinstated in his abbey and in the possession of his see.

In the same year came another outbreak of turbulence from Hincmar of Laon, the forcible seizure of a
New charges against Hincmar of Laon. fief to which he laid claim and the expulsion of Nortman, a noble, by his armed men. The king took up his noble's cause; the Bishop was forced to take refuge before the altar of his church. From thence he actually laid his whole diocese under an interdict: no rite of religion was to be performed in the closed and silent churches. The elder Hincmar put forth his metropolitan power, and annulled the in-

¹ Hincmar bitterly reproaches his nephew: "Videlicet quia statim ut a paternæ nido educationis factus Episcopus evolasti." — p. 598.

² Passages from the letters of Popes Lucius and Stephanus. The document, pp. 316, 333. — Hincmar, Op. ii. p. 323.

terdict.¹ The clergy, aghast, know not whom to obey, for Hincmar of Laon had appealed to Rome: in Rome he had probably long kept up secret intelligence. He turned his own theologic weapons against his uncle; with passages from the false Decretals he limited and defied the metropolitan power. The quarrel becomes more fierce and obstinate. Council after council meet, at Pistes (866), at Gondeville (868), at Attigny; they meet in vain. Hincmar of Rheims labors in prolix writings to assert the plenitude of metropolitan authority; he has found out that the new Decretals are not so absolutely above doubt, yet he dares not boldly to deny their authenticity. Hincmar of Laon asserts the unqualified supremacy of the Pope: Hincmar of Rheims asserts that the statutes of councils are of higher authority than the decrees of Popes; the Pope's Decretals owe their power to the authority of councils. Hincmar of Laon displays firmness worthy of a better cause: the bishops declare against him, and pronounce the interdict unlawful: the king accuses him of a breach of his oath of allegiance. He appeals to Rome; he exhibits letters of Pope Hadrian, summoning him to Rome. Already the Pope had entered into the con-
Interference
of Pope
Hadrian.
March 25, 871.
test; he had commanded the excommunication, without hearing or inquiry, of Nortman, the claimant and possessor of the disputed fief; he had reproved both the king and the archbishop for daring to forbid the Bishop of Laon to leave the realm and go to Rome. Hincmar of Laon fled to his city of Laon.

Hincmar of Rheims now, in the name of the king,

¹ The charges of Hincmar of Rheims against Hincmar of Laon contain 55 capitula, or charges, occupying above 200 folio pages in his works, from 377 to 593.

addressed an expostulation to Pope Hadrian; it was strong at once, and not undignified: "You have compelled me by your indecent letters, alike disparaging to the royal authority and unbecoming Apostolic moderation, and filled with outrage and insult, to reply in no very friendly tone. It is time that you should know that, although subject to human passions, I am a man, framed in the image of God, holding through the grace of God the royal dignity by descent from my ancestors; and, what is far greater, a Christian, an orthodox Catholic Christian, instructed from my youth in sacred and profane laws and letters.¹ You have neither legally nor regularly accused me of any public crime before the bishops, still less convicted me. Yet you have dared to call me a perjurer, a tyrant, a traitor, an usurper of the estates of the Church."² He afterwards asserts that the Kings of France are not the Vicegerents of the bishops, but the lords of the realm; and appeals to former precedents that none of his royal ancestors had been addressed in such terms by the predecessors of the Pope. This letter, however, takes no notice of the most flagrant invasion of the royal rights, the unjustifiable interference of the Pope in favor of the rebel Carloman, which must have been still pending, or at least not de-

¹ On the literary cultivation of Charles the Bald, compare Sir F. Palgrave's *Hist. of Normandy and England*, p. 273, and note, p. 729.

² The close of the letter is the most remarkable part. Throughout Hincmar appeals only to the ancient accredited decretals of Leo, Celestine, Gelasius, and to the African Councils. He closes with these words: "We are not ignorant that whatever is written from the Apostolic See according to the sacred Scriptures, the preaching of the ancients, and the authority of councils, is to be held and obeyed: whatever beyond that has been compiled or forged is not only to be rejected but refuted also." "*Quod sicut a quoquam fuerit compitatum sive confictum non solum respuendum sed et redarguendum esse cognovimus.*" — vol. ii. p. 716.

terminated ; it dwells entirely on the affair of Hincmar, Bishop of Laon. This affair, being a revolt, as it were, against the Metropolitan power of the Archbishop of Rheims, seems put forward by that prelate, as though the crime of his own kinsman and the rebellion against spiritual authority were the more heinous offence.

Hadrian had doubtless the sagacity to perceive his error. The correspondence between the king and the Pope became on both sides more amicable.¹ Carloman was abandoned, and to a tragic fate.² Unable to withstand the power levied against him by his A.D. 871. father, he again surrendered, was again imprisoned at Senlis. Two years afterwards he was brought to trial before the bishops, and degraded from his clerical orders. His partisans, however, and Carloman, no doubt, himself, rather rejoiced in this degradation, which opened again the path of secular ambition. He might aspire, if not to the throne, to a share in the dominions of his father. The bishops had, perhaps, by this time perceived that this division of the royal dominions at the death of each successive monarch was the inherent weakness of the crown, and, dreading a contest for the throne in the distracted state of the kingdom, attacked on every side by the pagan Normans, determined to secure the peace of the Church and kingdom. Carloman was again put upon his trial, and condemned to

¹ "Quasi tumores et læsiones vestras palpare sensimus, has oleo consolationis per dulcissimum melos caritatis, et sanctæ dilectionis unguentum fovere, lenire, et ad sanitatem perducere optamus." — Hadrian. Epist. ad Car. Carlv., Labbe, p. 937.

² See the Acts of the Synod of Doucy, Labbe, p. 1539, 1844. He was accused by the king as a perjured traitor and disturber of the public peace; by Hincmar, as contumacious against his metropolitan. Hincmar reserved to the Pope only the right of appeal given by the Council of Sardica. — Compare Planck, iii. p. 183.

death. This punishment was commuted for one more barbarous. His eyes were put out, and he was shut up in the Abbey of Corbey. His partisans contrived to carry him off, and conveyed him to the court of Louis of Germany, who named him Abbot of Esternach. He did not long survive his cruel treatment.

If the king triumphed over his rebellious son, so did Hincmar of Rheims over his rebellious nephew. Nor was the Archbishop's nephew more mercifully treated than the King's son. Hincmar of Laon suffered the same fate; he too was condemned, and suffered the loss of his eyes like Carloman. The two rebels against royal and metropolitan authority were thus joined in the same barbarous punishment. Both these events, however, took place after the death of Hadrian, during the rule of his successor. The death of Hadrian may have emboldened the clergy of France to take the affair into their own hands, and so to achieve their full victory.

Nicolas I. and Hadrian II. thus, with different success, imperiously dictating to sovereigns, ruling or attempting to rule the higher clergy in foreign countries with a despotic sway, mingling in the political revolutions of Europe, awarding crowns, and adjudging kingly inheritances, might seem the immediate ancestors of Gregory VII., of Innocent III., of Boniface VIII. But the papacy had to undergo a period of gloom and degradation, even of guilt, before it emerged again to its height of power.

CHAPTER VI.

JOHN VIII. THE SARACENS. THE DUKES OF LOWER ITALY.

THE pontificate of John VIII. is the turning point in this gradual, but rapid and almost total, A.D. 872. change; among its causes were the extinction of the imperial branch of the Carlovingian race, and the frequent transference of the empire from one line of sovereigns to another; with the growth of the formidable dukes and counts in Italy, which overshadowed the papal power, and reduced the Pope himself to the slave or the victim of one of the contending factions. The Pope was elected, deposed, imprisoned, murdered. In the wild turbulence of the times not merely the reverence but the sanctity of his character disappeared. He sank to the common level of mortals; and the head of Christendom was as fierce and licentious as the petty princes who surrounded him, out of whose stock he sprang, and whose habits he did not break off when raised to the papal throne.

John VIII., however, still stood on the vantage ground occupied by Nicolas I. and Hadrian II. He was a Roman by birth. He signalized his pontificate by an act even more imposing than those of his predecessors, the nomination to the empire, which his language represented rather as a grant from the papal

authority than as an hereditary dignity ; it was a direct gift from heaven, conveyed at the will of the Pope. Already there appear indications of a French and German interest contending for the papal influence, which grows into more and more decided faction, till the Carlovingian empire is united, soon to be dissolved for ever, in the person of Charles the Fat. John VIII. Aug. 876. adopted the dangerous policy of a partial adherence to France. The Emperor Louis, the son of Lothair, had died without male issue. Charles the Bald was never wanting in boldness and activity to advance his claims, just or unjust, to an increase of dominion. He marched hastily into Italy ; his nobles crowded to his standard. Of the two sons of Louis of Germany the elder attempted in vain to arrest, or was bribed to permit, his passage of the Alps. The Pope hastened to bestow the imperial crown on Charles. Dec. 17, 875. An Emperor with a title so questionable was not disposed to be scrupulous as to the author of the gift. "We have elected," writes John VIII., "and approved, with the consent of our brothers the other bishops, of the ministers of the holy Roman Church, and of the senate and people of Rome, the King Charles, Emperor of the West." In his letters to the bishops and counts of Bavaria, whom he forbids to espouse the cause of their king in the assertion of his rightful title to the empire, or to invade the territories of Charles, the Pope describes the march of Charles as almost miraculous, and intimates throughout that he was invited by the Church, in which resided the divine power of bestowing the empire.¹ No later Pope held more unmeasured language — "How do we discharge

¹ "Sibi divinitus . . . collatum." — Epist. cccxvii.

our functions as vicegerents of Christ in his Church if we do not strive for Christ against the insolence of princes?"¹ He speaks of "our son Louis, Feb. 876. your glorious king, if he be a son who has always been disobedient to our holy predecessors, if glorious who has waged unhallowed wars against Christians; 'bella gerens nullos habitura triumphos;' if a king, who cannot govern himself."² The Bavarian bishops are threatened with instant excommunication if they refuse to concur with the legates of John in preventing the war by mild or by threatening means. Another letter to the bishops who adhered to the title of Louis is still more violent; he treats them as Iscariots, as followers of the fratricide Cain. "They murmur not against Charles, but against God, the giver of crowns."³ But the historians are almost unanimous as to the price which Charles was compelled to pay for his imperial crown. He bought the Pope, he bought the senators of Rome; he bought, if we might venture to take the words to the letter, St. Peter himself.⁴

The imperial reign of Charles the Bald was short and inglorious. His brother and rival, Louis A.D. 876. of Germany, died during the next year, but left his kingdoms and his title to the Empire to his three sons. War broke out; Charles suffered a disgraceful defeat

¹ "Ubi est quæsumus, quod vicem Christi in ecclesiâ fungimur, si pro Christo contra insolentiam principum. . . ." — Apud Labbe, sub ann. The whole letter is remarkable.

² Epist. cccxviii.

³ "Neque enim contra Carolum est murmur vestrum, sed contra Dominum cujus est regnum, et cui voluerit ipse dabo illud." — Ibid.

⁴ Annal. Bertin. ad ann. 876. "Beato Petro multa et pretiosa munera offerens in Imperatorem unctus et coronatus est. . . Imperatoris nomen a præsule sedis Apostolicæ Johanne, ingenti pretio emerat." Ann. Met. 877. "Omnem senatum populi Romani, more Jugurthino corruptit, sibi que sociavit." — Ann. Fulden.

on the Rhine by Louis of Saxony. After his second descent into Italy, where Pope John met him at Pavia, he was in danger of being cut off in his retreat by the Oct. 6, 877. forces of Carloman, King of Bavaria. He died on the road, in a small hamlet in the Alps. As his physician was a Jew, it was generally believed that he was poisoned; though the Jews educated in the Arabian universities of Spain, were no doubt more advanced in medical science than any others in Europe.

John VIII., even before the death of Charles the Bald, might repent of having yielded to the Danger from the Saracens. temptation of bestowing the imperial crown on an obsequious but remote sovereign, who could so ill discharge his office of Protector of the Roman See. But where could he have looked for a more powerful protector against the formidable enemies which were environing the capital of Christendom on every side, the Saracens, and the no less dangerous Christian petty princes of Italy? The whole pontificate of John VIII. was a long, if at times interrupted, agony of apprehension lest Rome should fall into the hands of the unbeliever. The reign of the late Emperor Louis had been almost a continual warfare against the Mohammedans, who had now obtained a firm footing in Southern Italy. He had successfully repelled their progress, but at the death of Louis Rome was again in danger of becoming a Mohammedan city. The Pope wrote letter after letter in the most urgent and feeling language to Charles the Bald soon after he had invested him with the empire.¹ "If all the trees in the forest," such is the style of the Pope, "were turned into tongues, they could not describe the ravages of these impious pagans ;

¹ Ad Carol. Calv. Imper. apud Bouquet, p. 471.

the devout people of God is destroyed by a continual slaughter: he who escapes the fire and the sword is carried as a captive into exile. Cities, castles, and villages are utterly wasted, and without an inhabitant. The bishops are wandering about in beggary, or fly to Rome as the only place of refuge." The well-known story, whether false or true, by the belief which it obtained, shows the deadly hatred between the Christians and the Moslemin, and the horrors of the war. Salerno was besieged by the Saracens (this was at an earlier period, about the accession of John VIII.): the gallant defence of the city by Count Guaifer probably retarded at that time their career of conquest. The Saracen general, or king as he is called, is said to have violated a number of Christian nuns on the altar in the church of St. Fortunatus. While in this act of cruelty and guilt to one of them he was crushed by a huge beam, which fell or was skilfully detached from the wall. The maiden escaped unhurt.¹ The usual appellation of the Saracens by the Pope is Hagarenes, sons of fornication and wrath. In a passage in a later letter to Count Boso, the Pope describes the Saracens as an army of locusts, turning the whole land into a wilderness: extensive regions were so desolate as to be inhabited only by wild beasts.² The most terrible intelligence of all is that an armament of three hundred ships, fifteen of which carried cavalry, was in preparation to attack and conquer Rome. "Consider," says the Pope, "what a vast and unparalleled³ evil this would be; the loss of that city would be the ruin of the world, the peril of Christianity itself." In another pressing letter to Charles the Bald he says, "All Cam-

¹ Anonym. Salern.² *e. g.* Epist. xxxviii.³ Incomparabile!

pania is a desert; the Hagarenes have crossed the Tiber, and are wasting the suburban district; they destroy all churches and shrines; massacre the monks and clergy.”¹ Somewhat later he alludes to the starvation of Rome; some of the senate were in danger of perishing with hunger.² All this time, bitterly complains the Pope, the Christians, instead of flying to the relief of the Roman see, were engaged in unnatural wars against each other; wars in which John forgets his own concern.

Yet, if possible, even more formidable than the infidels were the petty Christian princes of Italy. “The canker-worm eats what the locust has left.” These Nov. 16, 876. The nobles in the Roman territory. appear to have been the inferior nobles, the marquises (marchiones) in the neighborhood of Rome. The more powerful princes seized likewise every opportunity of confusion to enrich themselves or to enlarge their dominions. “Those,” writes Pope John to the Emperor, “who are not unknown to you, trample down all our rights in the Roman territory, seize all that the Saracens have spared; so that there is not a single herd of cattle in all our domain, nor a single human being to commiserate or lament the desolation.”³ In many parts of Italy had gradually arisen independent dukedoms; and none of these appear to have felt any religious respect for the Pope, some not for Christianity. They were ready on every occasion to assail and plunder the city itself: for which they were sometimes punished, when the imperial power was strong; more often they defied its impotence.

¹ He entreats the Empress Richildis to influence her husband to protect him; his whole realm is confined within the walls of the city. — Epist. xxx.

² Epist. xlv.

³ Epist. xxx.

A Transalpine Emperor was too distant to maintain awe for any long time. In the South were the old Lombard Dukes of Benevento and Spoleto, the Duke of Naples, who owned a kind of remote fealty to the Eastern Empire, the Princes of Capua, Salerno, and Amalfi. On the vacancy after the death of Pope Nicolas, Lambert of Spoleto had occupied and pillaged Rome,¹ respecting neither monastery nor church, and carrying off a great number of young females of the highest rank.² Adelgis, the Duke of Benevento, had dared to seize in that city the sacred person of the Emperor Louis.³ The Emperor had fled with his wife and a few soldiers to a lofty tower, in which he was besieged, and glad to accept terms of capitulation.⁴ He was only permitted to leave the city after he had taken a solemn oath to Adelgis — an oath in which his wife, his daughter, and all his attendants were compelled to join — that he would neither in his own per-

¹ The cause of this insurrection was the rapacity of the Empress Ingelberga and the cruelty of the French soldiery with her. — Anastas. in Vit. Hadrian.

² At a later period, as appears by a letter of Pope John VIII., the same Lambert had demanded the chief of the Roman nobility to be surrendered to him as hostages. — Ann. Bertin.; Ann. Fuldens. sub ann. 871; Muratori, Ann. d'Italia, *ibid*.

³ Erchempert assigns two reasons why God permitted this humiliation of Louis: because he had insulted Pope Nicolas, and spared two Saracen kings, whom he might have put to death as Saul did Agag. — Apud Pertz, p. 253.

⁴ The popular verses current at the time show the profound impression made by this act of treason against the imperial majesty. It is a curious transition specimen of Italo-Latin: —

“Audite omnes fines terræ, horrore cum tristitia,
Quale scelus fuit factum Benevento Civitas,
Lhudovicum comprehenderunt sancto pio Augusto.”

The descent of the Saracens in great force was thought a providential visitation for the crime of the Beneventans.

son nor by any other revenge this act of insolent rebellion. No sooner, however, had Louis reached Ravenna in safety than he sent to the Pope to absolve him from his oath. Hadrian II., then Pope, began to assert that dangerous privilege of absolution from solemn and recorded oaths.¹ The two Lamberts of Spoleto were accused of conniving at, if not consenting to, this daring exploit.

The Duke of Naples, the Greek Emperor's subject, acted altogether as an independent prince. Sergius, who had succeeded his father in the Neapolitan dukedom, was accused of secret and friendly intelligence with the Saracens; of supplying their piratical fleets with provisions, and thus purchasing security for his own dominions by sacrificing the rest of Southern Italy. His uncle, Athanasius, Bishop of Naples (the high families of Italy now, as well as of the Franks, aspired to ecclesiastical dignities), had, at the commencement of his reign, reproved him for this alliance with the Unbeliever. Sergius, once imprisoned, afterwards drove his uncle, the bishop, into exile. After the death of the Emperor Louis, during the reign of Charles the Bald, the Pope, John VIII., was more earnestly desirous of breaking this unhallowed league between the so-called Christian and the Saracen. He tried in vain anathema and excommunication. At length he appeared in person at the head of an army with the two Lamberts, Dukes of Spoleto, who had received orders from the Emperor, Charles the Bald, to assist him.² Guaifer, Prince of Salerno; Paelear, Prefect of Amalfi; and Docibilis, Duke of Gaeta, were also on too friendly

¹ Liutprand. — Regino, lib. ii.

² Erchempert. Muratori, Ann. d'Italia, A.D. 877.

terms with the Saracens.¹ In a conflict between the two armies, twenty-two Neapolitans were taken and beheaded, as under the papal anathema, with the sanction of the Pope.² A second Athanasius, the brother of Duke Sergius, had succeeded to his uncle as Bishop of Naples. He was a man of lawless and unmeasured ambition, but with specious cunning sacrificed, as it seemed, all the ties of kindred and of blood to the cause of the Pope and of Christianity. He organized a formidable party in Naples, seized and imprisoned his brother the duke, and sent him blinded to Rome, where he died shortly after in misery and disgrace.³ The Bishop then took possession of the vacant dukedom; the civil and ecclesiastical offices met in his person as they had at Capua in the Bishop Landulf. The Pope, John VIII., highly approved of this usurpation, commended Athanasius because he had overthrown the new Holofernes, and had not spared his own flesh and blood. The Pope betrayed his inward triumph that a churchman had thus assumed the secular authority: he wrote to

Athanasius
Bishop-Duke
of Naples.
A.D. 876.

¹ By the assistance of Erchempert we trace the rise and progress of this race of lawless, independent princes. The busiest and not least lawless were the Bishops (in general of the ruling family) Landulf of Capua and Athanasius of Naples. Of these, Landulf, one of the four sons of Lando, Prince of Capua, became Bishop of Capua. Erchempert insinuates against him the worst vices — and he hated monks! — P. 251. Yet John consented to his episcopate, “Pandenuflus Landenulphum germanum suum *conjugatum* clericum fecit episcopum, mittensque Romam Johanni Papæ episcopum fieri exposcit, a quo et exauditus est.” — Ib. 255. Athanasius is briefly described: “Episcopus et magister militum.”

² “Octavo die anathematis xxii. Neapolites milites apprehensos decollari fecit: sic enim monuerat Papa.” — Erchempert, 39.

³ The fifth letter of John seems to have been addressed to Athanasius soon after his promotion to the bishopric. He there threatens Sergius with an irrevocable anathema (non dissolvendum). — Labbe, Concil. ix. p. 5. “Et Romam mittitur suffossis oculis.” — Erchempert.

the people of Naples confirming the title of Athanasius, and declared that divine inspiration must have guided them in the wise choice of such a ruler.¹

But the bishop-duke did not scruple to return to the unhallowed policy of his brother. He entered into a new league with the Saracens, gave them quarters, and, A.D. 877. actually uniting his troops with theirs, defeated the forces of Benevento, Capua, and Salerno, and opened a free passage for their incursions to the gates of Rome. It was this danger which caused so much alarm to Pope John, and called forth such loud and urgent clamors for aid from the Transalpine powers.² The united troops of the Christian bishop and the Saracens devastated the whole region, plundering convents and churches, desolating "towns, villages, cities, hills, mountains, and islands." Even the famous and holy monasteries of St. Benedict and St. Vincent did not escape.³

All hopes of succor from the Emperor, Charles the Bald, had been frustrated by his retreat from Lombardy, and his death. The Pope, who had gone to meet him at Vercelli, and had held a council at Ravenna, returned only to submit to an ignominious tribute to the Saracens. In vain he launched his anathemas: while they struck with terror remoter parts of Christendom, they

¹ Ad pop. Napolit. Compare also Epist. xlv.

² John hoped to obtain assistance from the Greek Emperor Basil, against his *subject*, as well as against the Saracens. The Greek fleet was in those seas; he begged him to send ten large vessels (achelandra) for the protection of Rome. — Epist. xlvi. This is urged to excuse the weakness of John in consenting to the patriarchate of Photius. — See above, page 36.

³ Joan. Epist. lxvi. lxvii. In one of the expeditions of Pandenulfus, one of the princes of Capua, who joined the Neapolitans and Saracens, the monk, the writer of the history of the Lombard princes, was taken, stripped of all he had, and carried away captive.

were treated with contempt by these lawless chieftains.¹

The Imperial crown was again vacant, and claimed by the conflicting houses of France and Germany.² But Carloman, son of Louis of Germany, had been acknowledged as King of Italy. Probably as partisans of the German, and to compel the Pope to abandon the interest of the French line, to which he adhered with unshaken fidelity, Lambert, Duke of Spoleto, that anti-Christ, as the Pope described him,³ with his April 28, 878. adulterous sister, Richildis, and his accomplice, the treacherous Adelbert, Count of Tuscany, at the head of an irresistible force, entered Rome, seized and confined the Pope, and endeavored to starve him into concession, and compelled the clergy and the Romans to take an oath of allegiance to Carloman, as King of Italy. For thirty days the religious services were interrupted; not a single lamp burned on the altars.⁴

No sooner had they retired than the Pope caused all

¹ Epist. xlv. Docibilis, Duke of Gaeta, had surrendered a fortress, on which, it was said, depended the safety of Rome.

² From the battle of Fontanet and the treaty of Verdun took place the final separation between France and Germany. Charles the Bald took his oath in Roman, Louis in German. The Roman and the Teutonic had begun their antagonism. — See Palgrave, p. 66.

³ Epist. lx. There are two letters to Lambert (lxii. and lxiii.), from the latter of which he appears to have treated the Pope with great disrespect, and to have assumed some control over the Legations (Ann. Fulden. sub ann.; see also lxxxii.). The Pope disguises this, and accuses Lambert himself of aspiring to the empire. He had before charged him with a design of permanently occupying the territory of St. Peter and the Holy City; of having sent an embassy to Sorrento to conclude an alliance with the Saracens, and to invite a reinforcement of their troops. — Epist. ad Concil. Trec. xc.

⁴ The clearest description of this is in letters to the Archbishop of Ravenna, to Count Berengarius, the Empress Ingelberga, and to Louis the Stammerer. — lxxxiv. vii.

the sacred treasures to be conveyed from St. Peter's to the Lateran, covered the altar of St. Peter with sackcloth, closed the doors, and refused to permit the pilgrims from distant lands to approach the shrine. He then fled to Ostia, and embarked for France.

When he reached the shores of Provence, John VIII. felt himself in another world. Instead of turbulent and lawless enemies (such were the Counts and Dukes of Italy), whose rapacity or animosity paid no respect to sacred things, and treated the Pope like an ordinary mortal, the whole kingdom of France might seem to throw itself humbly at his feet. He was received at Arles by Boso, Duke of Lombardy, May 11, 878. master, likewise shortly to become King of Provence,¹ and whose ambition aspired to the Empire. Boso, after having poisoned his first wife, had married, it was said by force, Ermengard,² the daughter of the Emperor, Louis II. Wherever the Pontiff went he was received with the highest honors. He summoned a council to be held at Troyes. August. Council of Troyes. Louis the Stammerer, King of France; the three kings, the sons of Louis of Germany, were cited to appear. Louis alone obeyed the mandate.

No Pope was more prodigal of excommunication than John VIII. Of his letters, above 300, it is remarkable how large a proportion threaten, inflict, or at least allude to this last exercise of sacerdotal power.³ The

¹ On the advancement of Boso to the throne of Provence, see Bouché, *Hist. de Provence*, pp. 738, 769; Palgrave, note 744. The Pope's first act was to erect Arles into a metropolitan see, and to grant the pallium to the Bishop Rostagne; afterwards he appointed him Legate, with full powers. — *Epist.* xc. et seqq.

² Ermengard was the last of the line of Lothair, the eldest son of Louis the Pious. — *Epist.* cxvii.

³ The wiser Nicolas had warned bishops against too frequent use of this

Council of Troyes opened with the recital and confirmation of the papal anathema against Adelbert of Tuscany and Lambert of Spoleto. The anathema was ratified with one voice by the assembled bishops, and commanded to be published in all their churches, and in those of their suffragans. Formosus, Bishop of Porto, the Apostle of the Bulgarians, afterwards Pope, the head, it seems, of the German faction, was involved with all his accomplices in one sentence of excommunication, degraded, and anathematized. The obsequious episcopal senate echoed each anathema with perfect concord. Another broad and sweeping excommunication comprehended all persons who should in any way usurp the property of the Church; they were excluded from the communion of the faithful, and, if they persisted in not making restitution, deprived of Christian burial. The Pope did not scruple, of his own authority and that of the council, to make an addition to the fundamental laws of the Transalpine realm. He found the Teutonic code imperfect, as containing no statute against sacrilege; he caused to be inserted that in the Justinian code, mitigating the fine from five pounds of pure gold to thirty pounds of tried silver. In return for this humble resignation of his authority, John VIII. condescended to crown Louis the Stammerer King Sept. 7, 878. of France; his queen was excluded from that honor, on account of some irregularity in her marriage. He rendered, moreover, to Louis the service of excommunicating some of his enemies, especially Bernhard, Marquis of Languedoc. The execution of this act was confided to another Bernhard, of Provence, who was to be re-

precious weapon: "Non temere ad excommunicationes procedant . . . ne auctoritas episcopalis vilescat." — Labbe, viii. 562.

warded out of the confiscation. Nothing was too lofty to defy, nothing too mean to escape, the fulminations of John. He will soon appear anathematizing the three great Archbishops of Italy — of Milan, Ravenna, and Naples:¹ he launched an excommunication, addressed to all Christians, against some thieves who had stolen his horses, and a silver cup belonging to St. Peter, when John was on his way to Troyes.²

The indefatigable Pope returned over the Alps by the Mont Cenis, to Turin, and Pavia; but of all whom he had so commandingly exhorted, and so earnestly implored to march for his protection against the Saracens, and no doubt against his Italian enemies, none obeyed but Duke Boso of Provence.³ For this extraordinary mark of fidelity the Pope showed extraordinary gratitude; he declared him, as Duke of Lombardy, his adopted son. Since the son of Louis the Stammerer, Carloman, was married to the daughter of Duke Boso, the Pope was thus bound in closer alliance with the house of France. The ambition of Count Boso aspired, after the death of Carloman, King of Italy, to the Empire. The death of Louis the Stammerer, and the intrigues concerning the succession to the throne of France, thwarted in one way the policy of the pontiff; in another, seemed to encourage his ambition, at least to strengthen, rather than mitigate, his animosity to the

¹ Epist. cxxviii., Milan, May 1, 879; cclxxviii., Ravenna; cclxx., Naples.

² Epist. xevii. In the Council of Troyes, which closed Sept. 878, the episcopal dignity was asserted by a decree that all the public authorities should pay the bishop the respect due to his rank — not sit in his presence till leave was granted; and this assertion was likewise guarded by excommunication. — Labbe, Concil. p. 314.

³ John, Epist. cxix.; Labbe, p. 89.

German Carolingians. He wrote to Charles the Fat,¹ the King of Swabia, hereafter to be Emperor, to warn him, under peril of excommunication, against any invasion on the dominions of Boso, his adopted son.² This was to close the gates of Italy against the Germans, to keep them beyond the Alps. If it had been the policy of John to erect a firm, hereditary kingdom in the north of Italy, in alliance with, and as a protector of the papacy against the Saracen and the lawless southern dukes, his object might, perhaps, justify this usurpation of authority. But his sole design was to obtain a kingdom for his adopted son. He attempted to summon a council at Pavia, as obsequious as that which had met at Troyes.³ In tone, partly of persuasion, partly of menace, he cited Anspert, Archbishop of Milan; Berengar, Duke of Friuli, and the Bishops of Parma, Placentia, Reggio, and Modena. Four times was Anspert summoned, twice at least excommunicated, and threatened with the utmost power of the Roman See.⁴ By this excommunication of Anspert he would establish his despotic authority over the Bishops of Lombardy. But Anspert and the Italian Prelates and Counts paid not the least respect to the papal summons or the papal excommunication: they neither appeared at Pavia, nor, in obedience to a later summons, at Rome.⁵ In Provence the adopted

Excommuni-
cation of
Archbishop
of Milan.

¹ Charles the Fat was the eldest of the three sons of Louis the Germanic.

² Epist. cxi. et seqq.

³ Epist. cxxvi. cxxviii.

⁴ The Pope afterwards invested the Bishop of Pavia, in legatine authority, with full power of excommunication; he interfered in the appointment of Anspert's successor, degraded a bishop consecrated by Anspert, and named another in his place. To the death of Anspert, John considered him under the sentence of excommunication.

⁵ Epist. clxxxi. clxxxii.

son of the Pope met with better success among the clergy. A synod of ecclesiastics met at a place called Montaille, in the territory of Vienne, and assumed the right of founding a new kingdom, of disregarding the rights of the sons of Louis the Stammerer, and of investing Boso with the title of King of Provence and of Arles. The influence of the Pope had no doubt great weight with the Bishops of this Council. Boso is said to have paved the way for his elevation by the promise of wealthy abbeys to be attached, by royal and papal authority, to the Episcopal Sees.¹ The Council consisted of the Archbishops of Vienne and Lyons, of the Tarantaise, and of Aix, with seventeen suffragan Bishops. Of their sole authority, though with some tacit consent of the nobles, compelled by the necessity of providing for the security of their churches, and acting at least with the implied assertion of divine commission,² they elect the King, but do not define the boundaries or extent of his kingdom. In their address they strongly impress on Boso his royal duties, especially regard for the honor of God, the protection of the Catholic faith, the exaltation of the Church. Boso received the gift with profound humility; he acknowledged that he received the crown from their good-will alone, and promised the fullest obedience to God's inspired priests.³ Thus Councils had become Diets or Parliaments, awarded and carved out kingdoms. The nobles of Provence make neither protest nor remonstrance.

¹ Labbe, Concil. Arles signs as Episcopus; but he had already received the pallium from John. — Epist. xcii. et seq.

² "Nostri Dei, per suffragia sanctorum . . . Christo præduce."

³ Apud Labbe, Concil. ix. p. 333.

Pope John in the mean time was compelled to crown the Emperor, Charles the Fat. Charles had marched with a preponderating force into Italy; John had met him at Ravenna, reluctant but obedient.¹ Though Charles was of the German line, the Pope yielded, yet he yielded with haughty condescension. "We have called you by the authority of our letters, for the advantage and exaltation of the Church, to the Imperial Sovereignty." The Pope enjoins him before his arrival in Rome to send some of his chief officers to ratify, in his name, all the privileges of the Roman See. He acknowledges the Emperor's power of making ordinances concerning the territory of St. Peter, which he is bound to protect against the Saracens and evil-minded Christians: "The Church must suffer no diminution, but rather be augmented in her rights and possessions."²

Charles the Fat, crowned Emperor,³ by degrees became master of the whole dominions of Charlemagne. For a few years the Empire of the West displayed its ancient unity. The kingdom of Arles stood alone in precarious independence. But though he received at Rome the Imperial Crown, the Emperor could afford no efficient protection against the Mohammedans. The Pope, who was founding kingdoms beyond the Alps, who was again interfering in the ecclesiastical quarrels of Constantinople, alternately absolving and excommunicating the Patriarch Photius, confirming or annulling the so-called general Council of Constantinople, was

¹ Aug. 879, Hincmar Annal.

² Epist. cexvi. cexvii.

³ Coronation of Charles, Christmas 880, or early in 881. See Muratori, sub ann.; Jaffé, Feb., March, 881. The western empire of Charles was properly only from 884 to 887.

trembling within the walls of Rome at the invasion of the Saracens, and in vain heaping interdict on interdict, not merely on the secular princes, but against an ecclesiastic, a more dangerous enemy.

Athanasius, the Duke-Bishop of Naples, still maintained in secret his unholy alliance with the enemies of the Cross.¹ The Pope visited Naples,² in order to persuade him to join the other Dukes in a general defensive league against the common enemy of Christendom. He offered large sums of money, which Athanasius received with unscrupulous avidity, and pledged himself to break off his wicked alliance. But the perfidious Prelate not merely kept up his amicable relations with the Saracens, he punctually received his share of the booty made during their ravages.³ The Pope, in the most solemn manner, pronounced the sentence of excommunication; he declared Athanasius suspended from his office, and cut off from the communion of the Church.⁴ It was not till a year after that Athanasius yielded, or pretended to yield, to the terrors of the sentence. He sent a deacon to Rome to assure the Pope that he had abandoned his infidel allies. But the mistrustful Pope demanded, before he would grant the absolution which he sought, some more convincing evidence of his sincerity. He required that Athanasius should commit himself with his old allies, by an act of signal perfidiousness and cruelty; that he should seize the chief of the Mohammedans, send them to Rome, and massacre the rest in

¹ Athanasius stood by no means alone. See the excommunication of the people of Amalfi for the same cause. — Epist. ccxxv. and cexlii.

² Epist. cclxvii.

³ Epist. cclxvii.

⁴ Epist. cclxx.

the presence of the Legates. By this *Christian* act, demanded by the head of Christendom, he was to obtain readmission to the Christian Church, and the right to officiate as a Christian Bishop.¹ It is almost impossible to trace the intricate labyrinth of intrigue, treachery, crime, war, which filled the later years of this Duke-Bishop. Nothing was done without an oath; and no oath influenced for a day his policy or his actions. His great object was to make himself master of Capua, an object seemingly attainable through the deadly feuds of the various descendants of the Ducal house, whom Lando, the Bishop, had committed in interminable strife. They, in their revenge, as each party obtained or lost the mastery at each turn, made or degraded a Bishop. The Saracens, in the mean time, courted by all parties, impartially plundered all, made or broke alliances with the same facility with the Christians,² while the poor monks, even of St. Benedict's own foundation, lived in perpetual fear of spoliation. The last days of John VIII. were occupied in writing more and more urgent letters for aid to Charles the Fat, in warfare, or providing means of war against his Saracen and Christian foes, or dealing excommunications on all sides; yet facing with gallant resolution the foes of his person and his power.

This violent Pope is said (but by one writer only)³ to have come to a violent end: his brains Dec. 15, 882.

¹ "Atque si præsentibus his nostris, Marino videlicet reverendissimo episcopo et sanctæ sedis nostræ arcario, et Sicone egregio viro, majores Saracenorum quantos melius potes, quos nominatim querimus, cum aliis omnibus caperes, et, *aliis omnibus jugulatis*, eos nobis direxeris." — Epist. ccxciv. 882.

² "Saraceni invitati ab omnibus, omnia diruunt, omnia consumunt."

³ Ann. Fuldens. Contin.

were beaten out with a mallet by some enemy, covetous of his wealth and ambitious of the papal crown. That he had enemies who would not have scrupled at such a crime, rests on his own acknowledgment, and these were men of high rank and official dignity. In the early years of his pontificate, Gregory the Nomenclator, and George his son-in-law, are accused of having for eight years, that is almost during the whole pontificate of John, committed the most enormous crimes, and aimed at seizing the papacy. The actual crime which called for the terrible sentence of anathema against these men was a conspiracy either to murder the Pope and his faithful adherents,¹ or to introduce the Saracens into the city.² They had been cited to answer this charge; and, after much suspicious delay, had seized a large portion of the treasures of the Church, passed the gate of St. Pancrazia with false keys, and left it open to the marauding Saracens, who might have surprised Rome. It is the most remarkable part of the affair that Formosus, Bishop of Porto, called the Apostle of the Bulgarians, and afterwards Pope, is involved as an accomplice in these dark charges, and named in the same sentence of excommunication. Yet the specific offences urged against Formosus are of a totally different kind — disobedience to the Roman See,

¹ "Summum Romanæ urbis pontificium, conjurantibus sibi dudum suis complicitibus factiose præripere affectavit." — Epist. cccxix.

² "Donec aut nos cum fidelibus ecclesiæ Dei potuissent perimere, aut Saracenos, quos jam per suos familiarissimos aequè Saracenos invitaverant, in Romanam urbem ad perditionem omnium intromittere valuissent." — Ibid. The letter which relates this conspiracy and the excommunication is addressed to the bishops of Gaul and Germany; and it is remarkable that it dwells strongly on the conspiracy being an act of treason, not to the Church only, but "contra salutem reipublicæ et regni dilecti filii nostri, Caroli, serenissimi principis."

and an attempt to raise Bulgaria into a new province independent of the Pope. From early times the Bishop of Rome in his person had been less an object of awe and less secure in Rome than in any part of his spiritual dominions; but this conspiracy anticipated the coming darkness of the next century. Either the Pope grounded on a false and wicked invention, or, at the best, on an unwarranted suspicion, this most terrible accusation; or there were persons of the highest rank in the service of the Pope, so blinded with faction, so infatuated with crime (for, according to the Pope, they were men of the most rapacious and licentious habits), on whom their allegiance to the Pope hung so loosely as not to make them shudder at shedding the blood of the successor of St. Peter, or at surrendering the metropolis of Christendom to the unbeliever.

Almost the first act of Marinus,¹ the successor of John VIII., was the absolution of Formosus, Pope Marinus. his release from his oath not to enter Rome,² Dec. 882. and his reconciliation with the Holy See. The decided partisanship of this measure declares the triumph of the German faction, and makes it more probable that the vacancy was caused by violent means. The enforced acknowledgment of Charles the Fat, as the master of the whole Carlovingian empire, by John VIII., would not necessarily combine the factions arrayed against each other during years of fierce animosity. It was a German Emperor who again ruled the world, and his

¹ Marinus, or Martinus II., 882, died May or June 884.

² Formosus had sworn (at Troyes, Sept. 14, 878) never to enter Rome, or to resume his episcopal dignity. "Formosus enim nequam angustatus jurejurando promisit: ut Romuleam urbem nunquam ingrederetur, ad reconciliationem sui honoris nunquam accederet, suumque episcopatum nunquam reciperet." — Auxilii Trec. apud Mabillon, *Analect. Vet.* p. 51.

supporters would seize the opportunity of more than triumph, of revenge. The short pontificate of Marinus was followed by the still shorter rule of Hadrian III., which lasted but fourteen months. That of Stephen V., though not of longer duration, witnessed events of far more importance to the papacy, to Italy, and to Christendom.

On the death of Charles the Fat, the ill-cemented edifice of the Carolingian empire, the discordant materials of which had reunited, not by natural affinity, but almost by the force of accident, dissolved again, and for ever. The legitimate race of Charlemagne expired in the person of his unworthy descendant, whose name, derived from mere physical bulk, contrasted with the mental greatness, the commanding qualities of military, administrative, and even intellectual superiority, which had blended with the name of the first Charles the appellation of the Great.

CHAPTER VII.

ANARCHY OF THE EMPIRE AND OF THE PAPACY.

AT the expiration of the Carolingian dynasty the question between the conflicting claims of the Transalpine sovereigns to the Empire was for a short time in abeyance. Italy aspired to name her own king, to assume that the Empire belonged of right to the King of Italy. But there was no one of her dukes, either of Lombard or Italian descent, so preëminent in power and influence as to command the unanimous assent: no Pope on the throne of Rome who could seize this glorious opportunity of securing the independence of Italy. Pope had been following Pope in rapid succession; and the feuds in Italy and in Rome, though the main cause of their animosity, the Imperial title, might seem removed, raged with unallayed ferocity.

Guido, Duke of Spoleto, and Berengar, Duke of Friuli, were put forward as competitors for the empire by their respective partisans in the South and in the North. At first Berengar and Guido agreed amicably to share the spoil. Guido hoped to obtain the Transalpine, Berengar the Cisalpine dominions.¹ But Guido had formed some wild hopes of succeeding peaceably to the French dominions of Charles the Fat.

Berengar and Guido assume the crown of Italy.

¹ Liutprand, apud Pertz, p. 250.

He entered, it is said, into an amicable arrangement with Berengar; and while his antagonist was strengthening his interest in Italy, crossed the Alps on his adventurous quest after the crown of Burgundy. He returned with the shame of having been scorned and foiled in this enterprise, and with the just imputation, which probably affected him much more, of having broken faith with Berengar, and so weakened the claims which he hastened to resume upon the kingdom of Italy. The dukes and counts of Italy were divided. Those of Spoleto, Camerina, Tuscany, joined the banner of Guido; the Lombards were generally on the side of Berengar. The bishops did not stand aloof from the war; they appeared in arms on either side. Yet the general feeling was still so strong against the unseemliness of Christian prelates mingling in battle, that the poetical panegyrist of Berengar, out of respect for the sacred ministry, refuses to record their names.¹ Two bloody battles were fought, one in the Brescian territory, one near the Trebia. In the last Guido won the victory, and took possession of Pavia, with great part of Lombardy. An assembly of bishops in Pavia assumed the right of electing Guido to the kingdom of Italy.² After the death of Marinus, Hadrian III. had ruled rather more than one obscure

Popes Hadrian III. and Stephen V.

¹ Apud Muratori, t. ii. p. 1. Throughout this poem Berengar is an Italian; Wido (Guido), a Gaul (Gallicus ductor); Arnulf, a German: he is the "Ductor Barbarus." The national distinctions and national animosities are growing more marked and strong.

² See in Muratori the decrees of this Council. There is a remarkable popular provision. The commonalty (plebei homines) were to be governed by their law. All illegal exaction or oppression was prohibited. Such injuries were to be redressed by the count; on his neglect or refusal, by the bishop, who, for this end, was to use his power of excommunication. — Art. vii. p. 415.

year.¹ The Pope Stephen V. had been chosen during the lifetime of Charles the Fat, in the presence of the Imperial ambassador ; yet the last Carlovingian resisted the assumption of the full Papal power with- Feb. 21, 891.
out his special consent. Stephen V. was crowned by Formosus, Bishop of Porto.² Stephen had espoused the cause of Guido with ardor. The King of Italy came to Rome, and was crowned as Emperor Sept. 891.
by the Pope.³ The death of Stephen, and Formosus.
the election of Formosus to the Papacy, changed the aspect of affairs, and betrayed the hostilities still rankling at Rome. By the election of Formosus was violated the ordinary canonical rule against the translation of bishops from one see to another (Formosus was Bishop of Porto), which was still held in some respect. There were yet stronger objections to the election of a bishop who had been excommunicated by a former Pontiff, excommunicated as an accomplice in a conspiracy to murder the Pope. The excommunicated Formosus had been compelled to take an oath never to resume his episcopal functions, never to return to Rome, and never to presume but to lay communion. The successor of John had granted absolution from these penalties — from this oath. This election must have been a bold and desperate measure of an unscrupulous faction.⁴ Nor was Formosus chosen without a fierce and violent struggle.⁵ The suffrages of a party among the clergy and people

¹ May, 884; Aug., Sept., 885.

² *Invectiv. pro Formoso*, apud Anastas.

³ *Annal. Fuldens.* sub ann.

⁴ *Liutprand*, sub ann. 891.

⁵ "Stephano quoque Papa, Adriani filio, viam universæ terræ ingresso, adunati sunt episcopi proceresque tui, clerici quoque et populus cunctaque vulgi manus, et venerunt in sedem Portuensem infra urbem sitam, cui Formosus præerat, papam eum acclamantes." — *Auxil. Trec.* apud Mabill.

had already fallen upon Sergius. He was actually at the altar preparing for the solemn ceremony of inauguration, when he was torn away by the Sept. 891. Inauguration of Formosus. stronger faction. Formosus, chosen, as his partisans declared, for his superior learning and knowledge of the Scripture, was then invested in the Papal dignity. Sergius fled to Tuscany, which adhered to the cause of Guido, or an Italian Emperor. Formosus and his faction may have preferred the common Papal policy, which dreaded the dangerous neighborhood, it might be the despotic power, of an Italian Emperor, and, as churchmen, thought the pontifical power more secure under the protection of a remote Transalpine Emperor. Personal hostility to Guido may have allied itself with this feeling; yet was Formosus compelled to send the Imperial diadem to Lambert, the son of Feb. 27, 892. Guido.¹ Already the Formosans were in correspondence with Arnulf, whom Germany at least had then acknowledged as the heir, though illegitimate, of the Carolingian house, — the sole heir of that famous race. Already Arnulf had claimed and exercised a kind of imperial supremacy. His authority ratified the election of King Boso to the throne of Arles (or Provence). He had threatened to descend on Italy at the first assumption of the kingly title by Berengar; but Berengar, eager for his revenge against Guido, now joined in the invitation of the Transalpine sovereign.²

Arnulf crossed the Alps at the head of a powerful

¹ Jaffé adopts this chronology seemingly on strong grounds. But I cannot help suspecting that this is an anticipation of the act of submission from Formosus, after the retreat of Arnulf.

² Document in Muratori, 893; Annal. Fuldens. Arnulf is summoned “ad Italicum regnum et res S. Petri a malis Christianis cruendum.”

army. He was received in Verona by Berengar, and one terrible example of German ferocity prostrated Italy at his feet in shuddering consternation. Bergamo dared to offer resistance; he hung the Count in full armor and with all the ornaments of his rank before the gates, and gave the town up to pillage.¹ In the language of the day, it made the ears of all who heard tingle. Milan and Pavia opened their gates. Guido fled to his territory of Spoleto. Even the powerful princes, the Marquis of Tuscany among the rest, were unable to stand before the terrors of the German arms. Their presumption in claiming certain feudal rights was resented by Arnulf. They were compelled to swear allegiance to Arnulf, as King of Italy; the claims of Berengar were dismissed with silent contempt.² But Italy, as usual, revenged herself by her climate on the northern army. Sickness broke out, and Arnulf turned back to the Alps. No sooner was he withdrawn than the party of Guido, now strengthened by many other Italian princes, who had been offended by the pride of the Barbarian Arnulf, rose up and threw off the yoke. Guido had died,³ but his son Lambert, already his colleague, assumed alone

¹ The siege is described in the poem concerning Berengar. Neither the churches, nor the sacred virgins, nor the priests, whose hands were wont to be kissed after the celebration of the mass, were respected:

“*Ecce verenda prius nullo sub honore tenentur
Atria, nam scissis pereunt velamina vittis
Virginis, impulsusque sacer fugit ipse minister,
Quorundam stringunt ambas quia vincula palmas,
Oscula quæ solitæ sacris sentire litatis.*”

— iii. p. 397.

² Anonym. Salernit. I follow Muratori in the sequence and dates of these events.

³ The prayers of the clergy, according to Berengar's panegyrist, had hastened Guido's death. — iii. p. 399.

the kingdom of Italy and the Imperial crown. Even Pope Formosus was obliged to affect an ill-assumed concord with the Italian Lambert.¹

But the next year² appeared again the invincible Arnulf. Italy quailed before him. Arnulf treated the claims of Berengar and Lambert with impartial contempt. Every city and castle hastened to tender submission. Though Italy's best allies, disease and pestilence, had already begun again to weaken the German army, and gathering movements in the north under Berengar threatened to cut off the retreat to the Alps, Arnulf reached the gates of Rome at the earnest supplication of Formosus, now the captive of his subjects.³ For there the faction adverse to the Pope Formosus had gained the mastery. They had the boldness, and imagined that they had strength to resist. Preparations were made for defence. Arnulf moved with his whole army to the siege of the imperial city, to the release of the Pope. A trivial accident betrayed Rome into his hands. A hare startled by the noise ran towards the city, followed by a hooting multitude. The Romans mistook this for a general assault, were seized with a panic, and many threw themselves over the walls. The Leonine quarter was easily taken; the whole city submitted to the conqueror. The first act of the ally and

Sept. 895.
Arnulf again
in Italy.

In Rome.

¹ "De ipso Lamberto, patris se curam habere, filii que carissimi loco eum diligere, atque inviolabilem cum eo concordiam se velle servare." — Frodoard Hist. Rem.

² During this year Arnulf had shown himself a faithful son of the Church, at the Council of Tribur, in which he had confirmed the power and privileges of the clergy, and recognized the supremacy of Rome.

³ Liutprand, i. 8. "A Romanis vehementer afflictabatur." — Hermann. Contract. in Chronic.

deliverer of the Pope was publicly to behead the chiefs of the opposite faction. The first act of the grateful Formosus was the coronation of Arnulf as Emperor. He declared null, as ex-
April, 896.
Coronation of
Arnulf by
Formosus.
torted by compulsion, the inauguration of Lambert. The next day the people were summoned to take the oath of allegiance to the Emperor. The oath was in these words: "I swear by these holy mysteries, that, saving my honor, my law, and the fidelity I owe to my Lord the Pope Formosus, I both am and will be faithful all my life to the Emperor Arnulf; that I will never assist Lambert the son of Ageltruda, nor Ageltruda herself, nor be accessory to the surrender of the city to either of them, or to their followers."

Arnulf ventured to remain in Rome no more than fifteen days. He left Farold, one of his great vassals, as governor and protector of the city. He marched towards Spoleto, where Ageltruda, the widow of Guido, had taken refuge. As he approached that city, he was seized with a paralytic disorder, attributed to poison administered to him by a servant of Ageltruda. Already was this crime in Italy the suspected cause of every sudden death or dangerous malady. He hastened almost as a fugitive to Germany. Though of the German party, Liutprand, Bishop of Cremona, sees the hand of God in this shameful flight of Arnulf. The Italian hatred of the German breaks through even party feeling. "Not merely did Arnulf assume all the glory of his victories to himself, instead of referring them to God, but the conduct of his troops demanded the divine vengeance. Priests were led about in chains; nuns violated; even the churches were no asyla; the soldiers held their profane orgies, performed their shame-

less acts, sang their ribald songs, indulged in the open prostitution of women, within the consecrated walls."

Before Arnulf had crossed the Alps, the Pope Formosus had died; all Italy had risen. The two factions of Berengar and Lambert were equally hostile to the Germans. Arnulf's governor in Rome seems to have exercised no influence in the election of the Pope, which was carried at once by the opposite party. The choice fell on Boniface VII. The new pontiff labored under the imputation of having been twice deposed for his profligate and scandalous life, first from the subdiaconate, afterwards from the priesthood. Boniface died of the gout fifteen days after his elevation. The Italian party hastened to the election of Stephen VI. Probably the German governor had withdrawn before Stephen and his faction proceeded to wreak their vengeance on the lifeless remains of Formosus.¹ Fierce political animosity took the form of ecclesiastical solemnity. The body was disinterred, dressed in the papal habiliments, and, before a council assembled for the purpose, addressed in these words: "Wherefore wert thou, being Bishop of Porto, tempted by ambition to usurp the Catholic see of Rome?" The deacon who had been assigned as counsel for the dead maintained a prudent silence. The sacred vestments were then stripped from the body, three of the fingers cut off, the body cast into the Tiber. All who had been ordained by Formosus were re-ordained by Stephen. Such, however, were the vicissitudes of popular feeling in Rome, that some years after

¹ Liutprand attributes the violation of the tomb of Formosus to Sergius, his former rival: he must be corrected by the acts of the Council of Rome under John IX. — Labbe, p. 502.

a miracle was said to have asserted the innocence of Formosus. His body was found by fishermen in the Tiber, and carried back for burial in the church of St. Peter. As the coffin passed, all the images in the church reverentially bowed their heads.¹

The pontificate of Stephen soon came to an end. A new revolution revenged the disinterment of the insulted prelate. And now the fierceness of political, rather than religious faction, had utterly destroyed all reverence for the sacred person of the Pope. Stephen was thrown into prison by his enemies, and strangled.² The convenient charge of usurpation, always brought against the Popes whom their adversaries dethroned or put to death, may have reconciled their minds to the impious deed, but it is difficult to discover in what respect the title of Pope Stephen VI. was defective.

Pope now succeeded Pope with such rapidity as to awaken the inevitable suspicion, either that those were chosen who were likely to make a speedy vacancy; or they received but a fatal gift in the pontificate of Rome. Romanus and Theodorus II. survived their promotion each only a few months.³ The latter, by his restoration

¹ "Hoc namque a *religiosissimis* Romanis persæpe audiivi." — Liutprand.

² See Flodoard, and the epitaph on Stephen, found in the time of Alexander III. After stating that "*reputet Formosi spurca superbi crimina,*" it says —

"Captus et a sede pulsus ad ima fuit
Carceris interea vinculis constrictus, et uno
Strangulatus nervo, exiit et hominem."

³ A.D. 897, Romanus, July, Nov.

"Quatuor haud plenos tractans in culmine menses."

Flodoard.

Theodorus II., Nov. Dec. Flodoard says that he sat only twenty days. Some months must have slipped out. Theodorus had time to reverse the decrees of Stephen, and solemnly to reinter Formosus. Theodorus seems to have aimed at reconciling the parties.

"Hic populum docuit connectere vincula pacis
Atque sacerdotes concordî junxit honore."

Flodoard.

of Formosus to the rights of Christian burial, and by his reversal of the acts of Stephen VI., may be presumed to have belonged to that faction. The next election was contested with all the strength and violence of the adverse parties. John IX. was successful; his competitor, Sergius, according to some accounts formerly the discomfited competitor of Formosus, and his bitter and implacable enemy, fled to the powerful protection of the Marquis of Tuscany.¹

John IX. was not content with the replacement of John IX. the remains of Formosus in the sacred quiet of the tomb. He determined to crush the opposing party by the decree of a Council. This Council—for the dominant assembly was always a Council (that of which the decrees were to be revoked was degraded to a synod)—annulled at once the unprecedented judgment passed on a dead body; it excused those who were present at that synod, as acting under compulsion, and severely condemned all who should use such violence against the clergy. It declared that the translation of Formosus from another see, though justified by necessity in his case, was not to be drawn into a precedent. The orders which he had bestowed were confirmed, the reordinations condemned. It sentenced the

¹ In the strange confusion which prevails throughout this period, it is doubtful whether this election of Sergius and his flight to the court of Tuscany did take place on two occasions, or whether the first is not an anticipation of the event which now took place.

“*Pellitur urbe pater, pervadit sacra Joannes,
Romuleosque greges dissipat ipse lupus.*”

So writes the hostile author of the *Epitaphium Sergii apud Pagi*. The more friendly Flodoard—

“*Joannes subit hic qui fulsit in ordine nonus,
Pellitur electus patriâ quo Sergius urbe,
Romulidumque gregum quidam traduntur abacti.*”

decrees of that synod to be burned. But June, 898. though John IX. was thus avowedly of the party of Formosus, he found it expedient to submit to the Italian Emperor. The title of Lambert was fully recognized at Rome: the coronation of the Barbarian Arnulf,¹ rejected with scorn. The secret of this apostasy was the utter extinction of the German party. Arnulf, by his flight, had become contemptible to the whole of Italy; and he was known to be dying of a slow disease. The Council endeavored to secure the more peaceful election and consecration of the Popes. The people were to demand, the bishops and clergy to elect, and immediately to consecrate in the presence of the Imperial Legates. No oaths or promises were to be extorted from a new Pope, except those sanctioned by ancient custom. Another canon prohibited the strange practice, which nevertheless long defied all authority of law, the right of plundering the Pope's palace immediately on his decease.

Nor did Pope John IX. lose the opportunity of condemning his rival Sergius, by the authority of a Council. He was excommunicated, with several other priests and inferior clergy, as accessory to the insults against the body of Formosus. Sergius laughed to scorn the thunders of his rival, so long as he was under the protection of the powerful House of Tuscany.

With John IX. closed the ninth century of Christianity; the tenth, in Italy at least, the iron ^{Died July, A.D. 901.} age, had already darkened upon Rome; the Pontificate had been won by crime and vacated by murder.

¹ Jaffé must be right in reading Arnulfi for Berengarii. — Regesta, p. 304

CHAPTER VIII.

CONVERSION OF BULGARIA.

YET in remoter regions, even during the ninth century, Christianity was gathering in nations of converts. One man, indeed, who is deeply involved in the fierce contests, loaded with the heaviest charges of guilt, struck by the condemning thunderbolts of the Church, and after a short period of hard-won power as Pope, dragged from his grave, insulted, then restored and canonized; the Pope Formosus, thus at once a leading actor and the victim in these fatal feuds, is described, by a poetical panegyrist, as the Apostle of the Bulgarians, the destroyer of their temples, as having endured many perils in order to subdue them to the faith.¹ The perils of Formosus as a missionary are the embellishments of the poet.² Formosus went into Bulgaria as a legate from Pope Nicolas, some time after the conversion of the King, in order to complete the Christianization of the people, and to correct the errors which they had learned from their first teachers, the Greeks.

¹ "Præsul hic egregius Formosus laudibus alter
Evehitur, castus, parcus sibi, largus egenis,
Bulgarie genti fidei qui semina sparsit,
Delubra destruxit, populum cælestibus armis
Instruxit, *tolerans discrimina plurima.*"

Flodoard, apud Mabillon, Secl. iii. Benedict.

² Anastasius in Vit. Formosi.

The name of the Bulgarians, a race next to the Huns, the most terrible and most hateful to the invaded Europeans, was known in the West as ^{The Bulgarians.} early as the reign of Theodoric the Ostrogoth.¹ Their Asiatic residence had been on the shores of the Volga; it is disputed whether the river took its name from the people, or the people from the river. In Europe, either mingled with, or bordering upon the Slavonians, they spread over a large tract of territory, from the shores of the Palus Mæotis and the Euxine, along the course of the Lower Danube. While the Teutonic tribes had gradually yielded to the mild yoke of Christianity (the fierce Northmen alone, who poured forth in their piratical vessels from the lakes and the havens on the Baltic and the German Ocean, still remaining heathen), for three centuries no impression seems to have been made on the Bulgarians or the Slavonians, who occupied the north-eastern frontier of the Empire. They were still rude, warlike, and chiefly pastoral tribes, inaccessible alike to the civilization and the religion of Rome. The Eastern Empire had neither a Charlemagne, to compel by force of arms, nor zealous monkish missionaries, like those of Germany, to penetrate the vast plains and spreading morasses of the re-barbarized province on either side of the Danube; to found abbacies and bishoprics, to cultivate the soil, and reclaim the people.

The first establishment of Christianity in Bulgaria took place in the ninth century. There is a ^{First conversion.} strange uniformity in the instruments employed in the conversion of barbarous Princes, and

¹ Eunod. Panegyric, in the sixth century. Pope John VIII., with the total ignorance of history not uncommon, asserts that the Bulgarians had been under the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff since the time of Pope Damasus. — Epist. lxxviii.

through the Princes of their barbarous subjects. A female of rank and influence, a zealous monk, some fearful national calamity; no sooner do these three agencies coincide, than the heathen land opens itself to Christianity.¹

The sister of Bogoris, the King of Bulgaria, had A.D. 863, 864. fallen in her childhood into the hands of the Greek Emperor; she had been a captive for thirty-eight years, and had been educated at Constantinople in the Christian faith. A monk, Theodosius Cupharas, had been long a bond slave in Bulgaria. During certain negotiations to avert war between the Empress Theodora and the Bulgarian King, an exchange was proposed of the captive Princess for the learned monk. If the monk had made any impression on the Barbarian Monarch, the gentle importunity of his sister still more favorably disposed him to the cause of Christ. A pestilence ravaged Bulgaria; and with that facility with which all polytheists try the powers of conflicting deities, Bogoris did not scruple to adore the God of his sister. The plague was stayed; the King acknowledged the might and the goodness of the Christian's God, but feared to encounter the more bigoted and obstinate Paganism of his subjects. He chose a singular method to undermine their prejudice. There were two monks from Constantinople, sons of Leo of Thessalonica, distinguished for holiness, zeal, and learning; Cyril (his proper name was Constantine) was familiar with the Greek, Latin, Sclavonian, Armenian, and Khazarian languages. The other, Methodius, was a monk, whose skill in painting had excited the wonder of the Barbarians. By the intelligible preaching of

¹ Theophanes, Chronograph.

this wonderful art, King Bogoris hoped to familiarize men's minds with the tenets of the Gospel.¹ A.D. 863, 864. But he knew his people; images of terror alone would touch their savage hearts. By his advice, Methodius painted the Last Judgment; he represented the punishment of the damned with all the horrors his imagination could suggest, or his pencil execute. The King shuddered at the awful spectacle by which he had thought to alarm others: he earnestly solicited Theodora for a priest to unite him to those sons of the Church who could alone hope for escape from that horrible destiny. The image-worshipping Empress, delighted at once with the progress of Christianity, and this testimony to the power of painting, lost no time in despatching a Bishop on this important mission. But the nobles of Bulgaria, and the mass of the people, were unmoved by the terrors which agitated the inmost soul of the King. The ceremony of the royal baptism could only be ventured under the veil of darkness; and no sooner had the secret transpired than a formidable insurrection broke out in favor of the national gods. The rebels invested the palace, threatened the King with death, and were prepared to raise a new sovereign to the throne.² But the faith of Bogoris was firm; he marched out to meet his revolted subjects with the cross upon his breast, and with only forty-eight attendants. At the sight of the courageous monarch, a sudden panic seized the insurgents; they fled on all sides. The King's vengeance showed no great progress in Christian humanity; he put to death all the rebel-

¹ Cedren. Hist. l. 2, p. 152. Symeon Logothet. apud Theophan. Contin. p. 664. Zonaras.

² Nicol. I. Respons. xvii.

lions nobles, with their families, not sparing an infant. To the lower orders his clemency granted a general amnesty.

Constantine, who is better known under his name of Cyril, who had been long employed in the conversion of the Khazars, on the north shore of the Euxine, was now sent by the Empress Theodora to complete the conversion of the people. Cyril spent some time in the country, and then passed on to the spiritual conquest of Moravia.

But the King of Bulgaria, either from the ardent interest which his new religion had awakened in his mind, or with political objects, aspired to enter into relations with Western Christendom. The fame of the Pope, and his acknowledged supremacy in the West, as well as his claim to be the successor of St. Peter, the vicar of Christ throughout the world, had reached the fervent proselyte. The brother of the King appeared in Rome to request the advice of the Pope on matters which perplexed the yet uninstructed faith of the barbarous nation. The contempt and hatred of the Bulgarians for the Greeks may have led them to suspect the purity of faith derived from that quarter. The quarrel for the See of Constantinople between Ignatius and Photius was at its height: and this suspicion may have been deepened by the well-timed or accidental visits of Latin missionaries. Hence the Bulgarians may have determined to have their Christianity from the highest authority.

The 106 questions submitted to the Pope by the King of Bulgaria, embrace every point of ecclesiastical discipline, of ceremonial observance, and of manners.

The Pope was Nicolas I., a prelate, whose name

might well have spread into the remotest regions, with all the awfulness which belonged to a supreme pontiff. Nicolas replied to these questions in a tone mild, Christian, and parental, except towards apostates to heathenism. His answers tend in general with wise discretion to mitigate the ferocity of a savage nation.¹

The King of Bulgaria is gently reminded that he has adopted the worship of a more merciful God; that the careless and Eastern prodigality with which he was accustomed to sacrifice human life was inconsistent with his new faith. The conscience of Bogoris was haunted by compunction for the massacre of his nobles. The Pope censures the cruelty, which involved the innocent children in the crime of their fathers; yet the massacre, as executed from zeal towards God, might be atoned for by penance. Nicolas should perhaps not be harshly judged for this leniency towards a passed and irrevocable act of barbarity, perpetrated under such circumstances. Apostates from the faith, who refuse to listen to the admonitions of their spiritual fathers, are to receive no toleration from the government,² but those without the Church God alone will judge. The simple people had inquired whether it was lawful to pray for their fathers who had died in unbelief; the Pope sternly prohibits this vain mark of filial affection. He could not, even if he would, mitigate the damnation of their fathers without weakening one of the most effective arguments for their conversion. But no violence

¹ "Veruntamen absit a mentibus vestris, ut tam impiè jam judicetis, quam tam pium Deum et dominum agnovistis; præsertim cum magis oporteat ut sicut hactenus ad mortem facile quosque pertraxistis, ita deinceps non ad mortem, sed ad vitam quos potestis nihilominus perducatis." — No. xxv., Labbe, Concil., p. 527.

² xviii. xlii.

was to be used against those who continued to worship idols, only all communion was to be avoided with them. The power which Nicolas demanded for the clergy was, in some degree, no doubt intended to soften the barbarity of the people.¹ The laws were to take their course against all ordinary crimes ; but even the adulterer, the murderer, the parricide, if he could reach the asylum of the Church, was under the protection of the Bishop, and to be judged by his milder judgment. Torture for the purpose of obtaining evidence is strongly prohibited.²

The Pope did not attempt to extinguish the passion for war in a people like the Bulgarians, even if he had any sense of its incongruity with the Gospel. They were to go to battle no longer under their old national ensign, the horse-tail, but under the banner of the Cross. On the question whether they were to refrain from going out to battle on holy days, he is guarded, and allows large discretion for cases of necessity. Instead of observing fortunate days and hours before they went to war, and using enchantments, sports, plays,³ songs and auguries, they were to go to the Church, to make offerings, to confess to the priests, and to perform such acts of charity as opening the prisons, emancipating slaves, and almsgiving to the poor. They had a stern but, no

¹ Awe of the priesthood was a first element of their Christianity. A Greek, pretending to be a priest, had profanely baptised many Bulgarians. The king, having detected him *by the inspiration of God*, had ordered him to have his nose and ears cut off, to be severely scourged, and expelled the kingdom. The Pope reproves the inhumanity of this punishment, and admits all the baptisms as valid. — No. lxxxvi. viii.

² No. xiv. xv. No. lxxxvi.

³ What were these *joci*? war dances, or ludicrous exhibitions of dwarfs and buffoons, such as delight savages? The Pope afterwards, in condescension to the weakness of their faith, permits such amusements, except during Lent. — No. xlvii. No. xxxiii. iv.

doubt for discipline very effective usage, that before battle some tried warrior inspected the arms and the horse of each soldier ; where they were found neglected or unfit for use, he put the offender to death. The Pope ingeniously suggests that greater attention should be paid to the spiritual preparation of the soldier.¹

On the ancient superstitions and manners of these barbarians these questions are less particular than will satisfy the curious inquirer. The king was accustomed to eat alone, not even his wife might sit down in his presence.² The Pope gently persuades to a more sociable and humble demeanor, alleging the example of the Son of God, who condescended to eat with his disciples. The warlike people were accustomed to administer their oaths on a sword driven into the earth as the most sacred symbol. The Pope commands them to substitute the Holy Gospels.

Polygamy he strictly forbids ; whoever, according to the ancient usages of the people, had two wives, was to confine himself to the first.³ Marriage within the prohibited degrees is interdicted, and spiritual consanguinity is declared to be equally close with that of blood : intermarriage with a godfather or his offspring is as incestuous as with an actual parent or kindred. The Pope delights in condemning some minute and superstitious usages enjoined by the Greeks in the marriage ceremonial and in the observance of Lent ; his rule is of course that of the Roman Church. Nicolas sums up

¹ Nicolas quotes Ps. xxxiii. 17, and Prov. xxi. 31. "The horse is prepared against the day of battle, but safety is of the Lord."

² No. xliii.

³ There was a singular question, whether after conversion they were bound to wear breeches (*femoralia*). The Pope answers that religion has nothing to do with their ordinary dress ; and extricates himself by giving the question a spiritual turn. — lix.

the whole with a solemn warning against the errors of the Greeks and Armenians, and earnestly persuades adherence to the one immaculate Church, that of Rome.¹

The allegiance of the Bulgarian Church to the Patriarch of Constantinople or to the successor of St. Peter was an object of contest during several centuries. Each could adduce evidence of voluntary submission on the part of the Bulgarians, the Greek the commencement, the Latin the completion, of the conversion. The Popes rested their claim not solely on their universal supremacy, but on that of the Archbishop of Thessalonica, to whose jurisdiction the province belonged, and who, as an Illyrian Metropolitan, was asserted to be under ancient subordination to Rome. The strife endured through the papacy of Nicolas and Hadrian II. Many angry and some expostulatory letters appear among those of John VIII. to Paul Bishop of Thessalonica : and during his own papacy Formosus steadily urged the work of conversion. The King Michael (such was the baptismal name of the Barbarian Bogoris after the Emperor of the East) must have been perplexed to hear that he had only learned error and heresy from his Greek teachers, that he was no Christian worshipper, but a blasphemer.² “It might even have been worse. Would he have embraced the Christianity of Constantinople when that city held Arian or Macedonian doctrines? If he had so done, he would have become a convert only to perish with his teachers in everlasting

¹ A more memorable question is what they are to do with certain profane books which they had taken from the Saracens (where and at what period does not appear). The reply of the Pope is in the true spirit of Amrou; “Let them be burned.” — No. ciii.

² Joann. VIII. Epist. lxxv. et seq. See on the other side the letter of Photius; a full defence of the Greek points of difference. Epist. l.

fire. The only security was in the irreprehensible Church of Rome." Ignatius was Patriarch of Constantinople when the Greek Bishops were warned to withdraw from the spiritual territory of Rome. But even Ignatius, though bound by his interests and gratitude to the unshaken supporter of his claims to the Patriarchate against the usurper Photius, would not surrender the rights of his Church over the Bulgarians. Ignatius, the Holy Patriarch of Constantinople, became almost as odious at Rome as his exiled rival Photius. This contumacy contributed to throw the Pope, contrary to the policy of his predecessors, and to the indignation of the West, which has been perpetuated by later writers, on the side of Photius. The hopes of the surrender of the Bulgarian provinces was among the temptations which induced John VIII. to acknowledge the title of Photius. Centuries did not reconcile the strife.

The Greek missionaries in the mean time, Methodius and Cyril, were passing on to new Christian conquests. The wars of Charlemagne had disseminated some compulsory Christianity among certain of the Slavian tribes. Other partial attempts had been made, especially by the Archbishop of Saltzburg.

Radislav, the Prince of Moravia, standing in need of a political alliance with the Emperor Michael, readily admitted these indefatigable monks into his kingdom. Before long the king, his brother, and the people were baptised, a church was built in honor of the Virgin Mary at Wilibrad,¹ and the Christian priests were held in such high respect by the nation that they were called by the name of Princes.²

¹ Wilibrad, now Hradisch.—Palacky, i. p. 122.

² The Church of Olmutz boasted higher antiquity; it was *rebuilt* by King Radislav and Cyril.

Christianity brought other gifts in her train. The Slavian dialects were as yet unwritten : their alphabet was the invention of Cyril.¹ This pious man and his colleagues not only so far mastered the language as to preach with success ; they translated, it is said, the Bible, probably certain books of the Scripture, into the dialect of Moravia, and even ventured to celebrate the services of the Church in that tongue. This great question as to the celebration of the Liturgy in the vulgar tongue of those barbarous nations who might embrace the faith, had raised no jealousy in the East, where Greek was so widely spoken. The translation of the Bible into the Mæso Gothic by Ulphilas had been hailed as a triumph of the faith.

Except perhaps among the Anglo-Saxons of Britain and the remoter parts of Germany which were subdued to Christianity by the sword of Charlemagne, throughout Western Christendom a large part of the population was Roman, or provincials who spoke Latin. At first the clergy continued to be of Roman descent. New languages were forming in Italy, Spain, and Gaul on a Latin groundwork ; the Latin services of the Church, therefore, ceased, only gradually and partially, to be intelligible to the common ear. No doubt the constant repetition of these services in the Church contributed to give the Latin element the predominance in these mingled languages ; and the transition was so irregular and imperceptible that there would be no precise time at which the sacred Latin would be called upon to abdicate its immemorial use as the Liturgical language. The

¹ The Pope (John VIII.) ascribes the invention of the Slavian alphabet to Constantine the *philosopher* (Cyril), as if his philosophy had been called into use in this good work.

Church could follow with difficulty, even in her popular preaching, these shifting and unsettled forms of speech.¹ Even in the more Teutonic parts of Germany, though the German language, in its various dialects, was beginning to sever Germany from France, the Latin and German or Theotisc oath taken at the treaty of Strasburg (the Latin by Charles, the German by Louis), was at once the sign and the commencement of the estrangement and future oppugnancy of the Latin and Teutonic. Still even in German Germany Latin had already gained and strove to maintain, through the clergy, its sacred and venerable character.

But among the Slavian tribes the Greek missionaries had penetrated into regions of unmingled Barbarism, where the mass of the people were entirely unacquainted with either of the two great languages of the Roman Empire. Rome by some untraced connection which had grown up between these Greek missionaries in Slavonia and the Roman See (the monks were probably image-worshippers, and so refused obedience to Iconoclastic Constantinople)² was called upon to decide this important question. The missionaries Methodius and Cyril, who were supposed guilty of propagating the fatal errors of the Greeks in Bulgaria, appear in Rome as the recognized apostles of the Slaves. They brought

¹ Charlemagne ordered Paulus Diaconus (in 782) to make a collection of his Latin sermons for his whole realm. Successive Councils—at Arles (Can. x.) and Tours (Can. iv. xvii.), as well as Rheims (xiv. xv.) and Mentz (xxv.)—commanded preaching in German as well as in Latin. The Heliand, the Muspelli, and still earlier poetic versions or paraphrases of Scripture, are of the reign of Louis the Pious and of his sons. — Gfrörer *die Karolinger*, i. 66. The subject will be resumed. The author of the *Chronic. Salernit.* (written in Lower Italy) speaks of the “*Lingua Tedesca quod olim Longobardi loquebantur.*”

² Methodius, it must be remembered, was a Painter.

the welcome offering of the reliques of Clement, the successor of St. Peter, which Cyril boasted to have found on the barbarous shores of the Euxine. Their creed was examined, declared unimpeachable Cyril died in Rome. Methodius was acknowledged as Archbishop of Moravia and returned with that title to his diocese. According to one account, somewhat legendary in its tone, at an early period under Nicolas I. and his successor Hadrian an amicable discussion took place, and Cyril by a triumphant inference from the words of the Psalm, "Let every spirit praise the Lord," (and if every spirit should praise the Lord, why are not the praises of the Lord in the mass and the canonical prayers to be sung in the Slavian tongue?) overcame the scruples of the Pope.

The controversy was renewed during the pontificate of John VIII. The Pope at first prohibited this departure from ancient usage, this desecration of the Church services by their celebration in a barbarous tongue.¹ Methodius, the Archbishop of Moravia, again appeared in Rome. He was received with the utmost respect. Again his creed was pronounced unimpeachable, his labors honored with the highest praise,² and the Pope declared that God had made other languages besides the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Latin; that it was not inconsistent with sound doctrine to sing the mass or to read the Gospel in the Slavian language. As a mark of respect, the service and the Gospel were first to be read in Latin, and then translated for the use of those who were ignorant of that language.³

From Moravia Christianity spread into the neighbor-

¹ Epist. xcvi.

² A.D. 880.

³ Epist. cxlvii.

ing Slavian principality of Bohemia. The Prince Boriwoy and his wife, afterwards the Sainted Ludmila, were admitted to baptism. Swatopluk, who valiantly, if not without perfidy, had thrown off the German yoke, and vindicated the liberties of Moravia, had married a Bohemian princess, sister of Boriwoy. The patriotic historian rejects as an unworthy fable that, so long as the Bohemian was a Pagan the Christian Swatopluk would only permit her to sit at a lower table in the banquet; he rejects also a rebellion of the Bohemian subjects of Boriwoy in favor of their native gods. Ludmila outlived her two sons, successively Princes of Bohemia;¹ but she had watched with more than a mother's care, a Christian mother's, the growth of her grandson Wenzel, under whose reign Christianity won the complete conquest of Bohemia, and who died not indeed by a brother's hand but by a brother's guilt, with the beauty of a martyr's death, if not absolutely as a martyr for the faith. Wenzel built churches in every city of the realm. God, says the legend, had given him such grace, that he could understand Latin books like a good Bishop, and could read Slavian without difficulty. He fulfilled all the works of faith, fed and clothed the poor, protected widows and orphans, redeemed bond-slaves, especially priests, exercised hospitality to strangers. Gentle and full of love to the high and to the low, his only care was the well-being of all. But the fierce Bohemian nobles hated the mild and peaceful Wenzel. His brother Boleslaw was at the head of a conspiracy; he attempted to assassinate the king with his own hand; the stronger Wenzel struck him down. "God forgive thee, my brother," he said; but he did

¹ Compare Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, i. p. 133.

not strike again. Wenzel was despatched by the other conspirators.

But Wenzel's work was done ; Christianity remained the religion of Bohemia ; Wenzel was worshipped by the people ; he became the tutelar Saint of the land.¹

¹ Palacky, 210

CHAPTER IX.

THE NORTHMEN.

THE ninth century beheld also the invasion of the remoter North by Christian zeal. The intrepid missionaries penetrated into those regions which were pouring forth their swarms of pirates on all the coasts of Europe. They sought the Northmen among their own dark pine forests, their blue fiords, and icy lakes. They crossed the Baltic and assailed the last retreat of the old Teutonic divinities, where the faith appeared in its fullest mythological character, in Scandinavia.

The tide of barbaric invasion, which had been thrown back by Charlemagne, began to pour again in a different course over Western Christendom. It was no longer vast hosts, or whole nations moving in masses upon the frontiers, entire tribes crossing the Elbe, the Rhine, and the Danube, and either retiring with their plunder or forming settlements within the territory of the Empire; it was by sea, and on every coast from the British Ocean round to the Adriatic, that the heathen Northmen on one side, the Saracens on the other, threatened the conquest of Christian Europe. The Saracens contested or had won the command of the Mediterranean; all along the south they had ravaged or formed settlements. Sicily was almost entirely Saracen; and they have been seen advancing along Italy even to the gates

of Rome : a mosque threatens to rise on the ruins of St. Peter's. In the next century, from a settlement in the province of Genoa, they infested the passes of the Alps ; murdered many passing English pilgrims in the defiles ; even reached Genoa in search of plunder.¹ The Northmen in the mean time were wasting the whole of Northern Europe. From the shores of the Baltic, from the Scandinavian islands, from the gulfs and lakes, their fleets sailed on, wherever the tide or the tempest might drive them. They seemed to defy, in their ill formed barks, the wildest weather ; to be able to land on the most inaccessible shores ; to find their way up the narrowest creeks and shallowest rivers ; nothing was secure, not even in the heart of the country, from the sudden appearance of these relentless ravagers. The invasion of the piratical Northmen had disturbed the declining years of Charlemagne himself ; that sagacious king had seen their approach with prescient terror. His wise policy had planned the only sure defence against such enemies — the building and keeping afloat a powerful fleet, and the erection of strong forts, with garrisons, at the mouths of the rivers. But during the reigns of his imbecile and disunited successors, these precautions were utterly neglected. They had not an armed ship on the seas, and not a standing troop of soldiers ; the desultory forces, which they raised, dispersed immediately the campaign was over. Year after year these plundering expeditions were becoming more incessant, more ubiquitous. Not a province in any of the kingdoms, hardly a city in the most inland district escaped these terrible visitants.² The

¹ Flodoard.

² There is no necessity, with Gfrörer, die Karolinger, to suppose that the

civil wars which still continued throughout these disastrous years, with the gradual decline of the warlike nobility and the absorption of the great fiefs by the churches and the monasteries, yielded up the country almost defenceless to the merciless invader. The great feudatories, the descendants of the Frankish chieftains who had conquered Gaul, and received large grants of land, were rapidly dying out. When most needed to head their hardy vassals, they had either perished in the strife between the different branches of the feeble and hostile Carlovingians, or had retired into the cloister. Instead of bequeathing a noble estate, with strongly fortified castles, and a hardy band of followers, the Baron had alienated it to the all-absorbing church, and for the stronghold a peaceful and defenceless monastery had arisen. At the fatal battle of Fontanet, were said to have fallen 100,000 men. The poet, the historian, describe Fontanet as yielding up the defenceless realm to the Normans.¹ That very year, Osker, the Norman, warped up the Seine, burned Rouen; in his descent, burned the rich abbey of Jumièges. Fontenelle bought its security at a high price.² From that time every

Normans were hired or urged by the hostile sons of Louis the Pious to invade each other's dominions. Gfrörer is again too keen-sighted.

¹ According to the Ravennese biographer, 40,000 fell on the side of Lothair alone.

“La perit de France la flor,
Et des Barons tuit le meillor,
Ainsi trovèrent Palens terre
Vuide de gens, bonne a conquerre.”

Wace, Roman de Rou, i. p. 16.

“Totam Franciam, militum præsidio nudam, cujus robur in bello Fontanido nuper deperierat, tantus metus corripuerat, ut Normannis nemo possit resistere, nemo possit repellere.” — *Fragm. Historic. Duchesne, Script. Num. iii. p. 334.* See other quotations in Depping, *Histoire des Normands*, p. 68; Eginhard, *Vit. Car. p. 452.*

² See Sir F. Palgrave's picturesque description of this expedition, p. 322.

river of France was darkened with the black sails of the Normans. They sailed up the Somme — Abbeville, Amiens, all Picardy lay waste. Again they sailed up the Seine — Rouen, Paris, were in the power of the ferocious Regnar Lodbrok. They were in the Loire — Nantes, Orleans, Blois, Tours (once saved, it was believed by the all-powerful reliques of St. Martin), had been saved only to fall on the next assault into more terrible ruin: Angers, Chartres, were burned. They struck inland to Bourges, to Clermont. They were in the Garonne — Bordeaux, Toulouse, Saintonge, Auch, Limoges, Poitiers, Tarbes, were in flames. It is an appalling and significant fact that the Pope consented to transfer the useless Archbishopric of Bordeaux to Bourges, even though Bourges, in the heart of the land, had not been secure. They followed the coasts of Spain. They ran up the Groyne, the Tagus, the Guadalquivir. In the south of Spain they encountered the Saracens: near Seville met the fleets of the worshippers of Odin and the followers of Mohammed. The Arabic chronicles are not silent on the descents of these new unbelievers. They roved along the Mediterranean; they forced their way against the stream of the rapid Rhone. Arles, Nismes, even Vienne, suffered the inevitable fate of conflagration and pillage. One adventurous band had heard some vague rumors of Rome, of her vast wealth.¹ They sailed across; mistook the Magra for the Tiber; landed near the fine old Etruscan city of Luna. The Bishop and his clergy were celebrating mass on Christmas day, when they heard of these unknown strangers; they received them with courteous Christian hospitality. Hasting, the famous leader, sub-

¹ Depping, ii. 2, p. 80.

mitted to baptism. Ere long the Norman camp rang with shrieks of sorrow — Hasting was dead. Some nights after they entreated sepulture for Hasting in the holy cloister. The great captain was borne amid his weeping followers to the grave. As they were about to lower the bier, up sprang the dead man, and cut the bishop to the earth. The priests were massacred; the city plundered; all the wealth of Luna, her beautiful women, and all her youths who could run, were swept on board the fleet. So ran the Norman legend. Italian history has preserved a fragmentary record of this wild event.¹ Pisa too is said to have been surprised and sacked.

Germany was not more secure. Very early the Scheldt, the Wahl, the Lys, had been made high-roads to the mercantile cities of Flanders. Year after year, Utrecht, Antwerp, Ghent, Courtray, were pillaged. The broad Rhine was too tempting a road. Nimeguen, Cologne, Bonn, Coblentz, Bingen, even as far as Worms, opened their gates, or had their gates beaten down by the irresistible pirates. Mentz alone seems to have been secure behind her strong walls. On their descent, they sacked Treves. Archbishop Hincmar fled with the reliques of St. Remi, from Rheims: he fled to die in terror and obscurity. From some unknown cause the adventurers did not penetrate into Rheims, though they plundered all the monasteries around; but in Aix-la-chapelle the barbarous Normans pitched their camp in the palace courts of Charlemagne. Charlemagne's descendants submitted year after year

¹ Depping, 112. "Luna civitas a Normannis dolo capta." — *Fragm. Chronic.*; Muratori, *Ant. Ital.* i. 25. "La città di Luni fu dislatta per gente ultramontane." — Villani.

to ignominious capitulations. The peace which they could not win, which they rarely strove to win, with the sword, was bought by large sums of money. Charles the Bald, Louis the German, each of the conflicting kings, who called themselves the sovereigns of the empire, paid in turn this ruinous and disgraceful tribute.

The Northmen were heathens ; their ferocious religion no doubt exasperated their natural ferocity ; their gods, like themselves, were warriors and pirates. But they did not, like the Saracens, wage a religious war. Providentially these Arabs of the sea had no Mohammed to organize the Scandinavian tribes into one vast host ; to give them the unity and force of a new Northern Caliphate. They had no ambition to propagate their faith. Perhaps they would have been unwilling to share with others the protection of their warlike gods. They had rather that their enemies should believe in a milder religion, which yielded them up unresisting, or feebly resisting, to the plunderer or the conqueror. They destroyed, with indifferent ferocity, the church and the castle. Their indiscriminate rapacity plundered alike the monastery or the farm. They massacred with as little remorse the bishop or the monk, as the count or his vassal. If their chief ravages appear to have been made upon religious edifices or estates, it was only because these were more defenceless, or offered a richer booty ; and because the only chroniclers, the monks, have been more eloquent on their own sufferings ; have dwelt on the sacrilegious, more than on the inhuman acts of their common enemies. The Church now paid dearly for her wealth and possessions : the richer the abbey, the more tempting the prey, the more remorseless the plunderer. France was covered with

bishops and monks, flying from their ruined cloisters, their burning monasteries, their desolate churches, bearing with them the precious reliques of their saints — their saints who could not defend their violated sanctuaries — and so deepening the universal panic. And everywhere they went they preached despair. The Normans were the instruments in God's hands for the punishment of the sins of the people: it was vain to resist the wrath of God; and so a wretched fatalism bowed to a more utter prostration the cowed and spiritless race. Even the few ecclesiastics, who saved something from the common wreck, were taxed for the tribute paid by the kings, and bitterly taunted the kings with this profane invasion of the property of the Church. The great ecclesiastics, indeed, were not all so unwarlike; here and there an abbot took upon him the uncongenial function of captain over his own troops. In the famous siege of Paris, as it were the con- A.D. 885.

summation of the Norman conquests, the defenders of the city, with the valiant Count Eudes, were the Bishop Gozlin and his nephew Ebles, Abbot of St. Denys.¹ Yet no sooner had the Normans from wandering pirates become conquerors of the soil; no sooner had they taken possession of Normandy, than they submitted to Christianity; and it is singular, that they ceased to be Teutons as well as Pagans. The followers of Rollo became Frenchmen as well as Christians; so at a later period, the Normans, already Christians, in Naples became Italians.²

¹ Depping, iii. 1, p. 218. The ten months' siege of Paris had its monkish Homer, Abbo. A later poet, more Homeric, Ariosto, had that siege in his thought when he brought the Saracen Agramont under the walls of Paris. Sir F. Palgrave has quoted some of his stanzas.

² See Guizot, *Collect. des Mémoires*, tom. vi.

Christianity had made some efforts, at an earlier period, to reach the remote regions from which issued forth these terrible Pagans, but without marked or signal success. A fortunate or providential event opened Denmark to her exertions. A contested succession to the throne of that kingdom had driven one of the princes, Harold, to the court and to the protection of Louis the Pious. Charlemagne had already, during his Saxon conquests, entered into an alliance with the ancestor of Harold. That prince embraced the faith of Christ, not only as the price of succor in the contest for his throne, but in zeal and sincerity; he was baptised at Ingelheim with great pomp in the year 826.¹ His sponsors were the Emperor, the Empress Judith, and King Lothair. The return of Harold to Denmark seemed to the Danish Prince, to the bishops of the empire, and to the pious Emperor, too favorable an opportunity to be neglected for the promulgation of the Gospel in that heathen kingdom. A zealous and devoted missionary was invited to undertake the perilous adventure.

The abbey of Corbey, near Amiens, was the great monastic institution in that part of the Empire. Among the abbots had been the famous princes Adalhard and Wala, illegitimate scions of the race of Charles Martel. In that abbey there was a monk of noble French descent, of the gentlest disposition, but of deep and settled piety.² From his childhood he had been possessed by

¹ Bishop Munter suggests, rather too positively, that the king must have made the renunciation in the form enacted by S. Boniface at the synod of Salzburg, A.D. 742.—Eccard. Franc. Orient. i. 440. "Forsachistu Diabolæ? R. Ec forsacho Diabolæ. End allum Diabold gelde. R. End ec forsacho allum Diabold gelde. End allum Diaboles Wercum end Wordum. R. End ec forsacho allum Diaboles Wercum end Wordum. Thunaer ende Woden end Saxnote; ende allem them Unholdum, the hera Genotes sint."—G. Ch. Dan. et Norw. p. 268.

² Anschar was born Sept. 8, 801.

an ardent imagination; and that imagination, as was sure to be the case in that age, had yielded itself up as a willing bond-slave of religion. At the early age of five, his mother's death had made a strong impression on the sensitive child. A remarkable dream decided his calling. In his sleep he fancied himself struggling on a miry and slippery ground, beyond which lay a beautiful meadow. There he beheld a lady of stately form, in rich attire, surrounded by females in white apparel; among them his mother. He strove to reach her, but the mire clung around his feet, and he could not struggle onward. The soft voice of the majestic lady, the Virgin herself, addressed him, "My son, wouldest thou join thy mother?" He replied, "Most earnestly do I wish it." "He who would come to us must flee those vanities which we abhor." *Æt.* 13.

From that moment the serious child, abandoning all sport and gayety, was devoted to prayer and study. Up to adolescence he was educated in monastic discipline, but the ardor of youth had begun to relax his strict austerity. At that time the world was startled by the tidings of Charlemagne's death. That the mighty monarch of so many kingdoms must suffer the common mortality of man, struck the imaginative youth. His life became, as it were, one vision. Once he thought that he had died suddenly; and at the moment of his death he prayed to the apostle St. Peter and to St. John the Baptist, who appeared instantly before him.¹ He

¹ As Anschar knew them at once, it must be supposed that the saints appeared as usually represented in works of art at that time. St. Peter was the older, with a hoary head, the hair flat and bushy; a ruddy complexion, but rather sad countenance; his dress white, but mingled with colors (*candidâ et coloratâ*); his stature short. The Baptist was young, tall, with a sprouting beard; the hair rather dark and curling; the face emaciated, but

was conducted by his saintly guides to Purgatory, where he passed three days in darkness, and almost suffocation; those days appeared a thousand years. He passed on to heaven, whose inhabitants and their glory he was permitted to behold; and a voice of the most exquisite sweetness, but so clear that it seemed to fill the world, spoke to him out of the unapproachable light, "Go, and return hither, crowned with martyrdom."¹ On this triumphant end, which he gained at last, not by the sword, but by the slow mortification of his life, was thenceforth set the soul of Anschar.

His thoughts had no doubt been already turned towards the conversion of the heathen by his residence in a monastic outpost of Christendom, founded by the zeal of the Corbey monks in a beautiful valley on the west bank of the Weser, east of Paderborn, and called *Æt.* 16, 23. New Corbey.² In this convent he had been appointed to preach to the people, and doubtless prepared himself for his future successes.

When the demand was made at the court of Louis the Pious, among the assembled prelates and nobles, who could be found fit and willing to attend the Christian Harold into his Pagan country, and to risk his life for the propagation of the faith, all were silent, until Wala, the abbot of Corbey, bethought him of Anschar. The monk was summoned, and calmly but resolutely undertook the mission. The abbot inquired whether he acted but in obedience to his superior, or from his own free

the countenance pleasant. He wore a *silken dress*. "Those who wear silk dresses are in kings' chambers!"

¹ The biographer relates this fine vision, as he says, in the words of Anschar himself. *Vit. S. Anscharii* apud Pertz, vol. ii. p. 692.

² It was near the modern Höxter, in Westphalia. It is described by Paschasius Radbertus in his life of Adalhard.—Pertz, ii. p. 531.

will. He modestly persisted in his determination, unshaken by the persuasion of those who loved him, and the reproof of others, who, unable to aspire to the sublimity of his faith, were jealous of his superiority.

A brother of the convent, named Autbert, though of noble birth, was so kindled by the zeal of Anschar, that he resolved to accompany him. Anschar spent two years in Denmark, but over his difficulties and his successes the biographer passes with unsatisfactory rapidity. He formed a school of twelve children. At the end of the two years his companion retired, in the extremity of sickness, to New Corbey, and died.

But whatever the success of Anschar in Denmark, the more remote regions of the North suddenly opened on the zealous missionary. An embassy from Sweden announced that many of that nation were prepared to accept Christianity. Anschar did not hesitate at once to proceed to this more distant and unknown scene of labor. As he crossed the Sound, his ship was attacked by pirates ; he escaped with difficulty to the shore, losing all he possessed, especially the precious treasure of forty books. On his arrival in Sweden, the reigning king allowed him full liberty to preach the Gospel. There were many Christian captives in the land, who gladly welcomed a priest who could administer the sacred mysteries of the faith. Anschar, after some time, returned to France ; and Gauzbert, a Frankish monk, was sent as Bishop to Sweden.

In the mean time the archbishopric of Hamburg had been founded. Anschar was raised to the see, A.D. 832. and invested with metropolitan power over all the northern missions. But the Northmen had A.D. 837.

as yet learned no respect for Christianity. They surprised Hamburg. Anschar hardly escaped, bearing away nothing but the reliques of the saints ; every thing else, even his library, was burned to ashes.

The prospects of Christianity in Sweden were suddenly darkened. The king had favored the preachers of the Gospel ; the people were still obdurately wedded to their idolatry. An insurrection broke out ; one Christian teacher suffered death ; the Bishop was seized and expelled from the kingdom. For seven years Paganism triumphed without disturbance. Anschar in the mean time had been reinstated in the archiepiscopate, now formed by the union of Hamburg with Bremen. More hopeful intelligence came from Sweden ; it was rumored that all who had been concerned in the insurrection had, in some awful manner, been marked for untimely death : the possessor of a book, which had been taken during the pillage by his son, was more signally visited by the Divine wrath. But either from prudence or timidity, the Bishop Gauzbert represented himself as personally so obnoxious to the hatred of the people, that his presence could but excite more bitter hostility. Anschar did not hesitate to obey the call ; and in the account of this mission appear some curious incidents, characteristic of the versatile Paganism of the country. " If," it was said, " you want a new God, there is your late king, Eric, in whose honor we have lately built a temple." But Anschar, however strongly dissuaded, determined again to try his influence on the Christians' old protector, the king. He invited him to a feast, made him presents ; but the king, become more cautious or more timid, declared that on so great a question he would consult his people

and his gods. True to his word, he first held a private council of his nobles, where it was agreed to consult the gods by lots. The lot was favorable to the acceptance of Christianity; the whole people were then assembled in their parliament; and the herald publicly proclaimed the object of their meeting, the admission or rejection of Christianity. The people were of conflicting opinions. A tumult had almost begun, when an aged man arose, and declared that the God of the Christians had been singularly powerful and propitious, in saving him and others from the perils of the sea, and from pirates. "It would be much wiser, since our own gods are not always so favorable, to have this God also, who is so mighty, and so ready a Protector."¹ This prudent advice carried with it the whole assembly. Christianity was admitted by general consent as a religion permitted by the nation. Churches might be built, and priests allowed to celebrate the mysteries of the faith. On the death of the king, some opposition was at first threatened by his son. His hostility died away; the Christians were even allowed to set up a bell, which seems to have been peculiarly detested by the Swedish Pagans. Once having obtained a footing, Christianity wrought slowly on, till it had achieved the final conversion of the kingdom. But it was not till above a century and a half later, that, under the reign of Canute the Great over the united Christian kingdoms of England and Denmark—were sent over to Denmark English priests and bishops, for the final conversion of his whole continental realm. Canute him-

¹ "Nobis enim quando nostros propitios habere non possumus Deos, bonum est hujus Dei gratiam habere, qui semper in omnibus potest et vult ad se clamantibus auxiliari." — c. xxvii. p. 713.

self bore as it were the homage of his two Teutonic kingdoms to the feet of the Pontiff of Latin Christianity.¹ The tenth century saw the first dawn of Christianity in Norway.

¹ S. Anschar died A.D. 865. Canute king from 1014 to 1055. Canute visited Rome A.D. 1026 or 1027.

CHAPTER X.

ALFRED.

THE Christianity of the age, by this aggrandizement of the sacerdotal order, and by the civil wars among the descendants of Charlemagne, seemed to deliver France, and parts of Germany, almost defenceless into the hands of the Pagan Barbarians. A Christian King rescued one part of Europe, which was in still greater danger, from total subjugation to the heathen Northmen.

Our English Alfred¹ approaches, as near as possible, considering his age, to that lofty model, a Christian Sovereign. Some irregularities in his early youth Alfred were supposed to be chastised by a severe and inexplicable malady, which seized him at the time of his marriage, and afflicted him during twenty years of his life with excruciating suffering. Even his serene temper was exasperated, in the course of the terrific warfare with the Danes, to some acts of more than necessary cruelty and revenge.

The mind of Alfred was deeply impregnated with true Christian faith. As a child he had been twice taken to Rome, but too early, probably, for the majestic sanctity of the holy city to make much impression: yet, no doubt, some vague feeling of reverence must have been left upon his mind by his solemn anointing, as

¹ Alfred was born 849; in Rome, 853 and 855; died, 901.

King of Demetia, by the Pope himself. In his youth he was singularly devout ; rose before the cock crew for the religious services ; and in all the dangers, the troubles, the perpetual wars, the absorbing cares of government, he never intermitted the daily mass, or any of the prayers or ceremonies of the Church.

The heroism of Alfred's resistance to the Danes was not only that of a patriotic sovereign, enduring every extremity in defence of his country against a foreign foe, but that of a Christian offering an inflexible resistance to Pagans and Barbarians. Religious hope, religious reliance on God, animated him in battle ; religious resignation to the divine will sustained him in the depths of adversity. His war against the Danes was a crusade, with all which demands generous sympathy and admiration — nothing which shocks the purer Christian feeling.

Alfred alone rescued England from a total return to Paganism and barbarity ; and delayed the Danish conquest till the Northmen had been at least partially conquered, and in some degree softened by Christianity. So nearly was this retrogressive movement achieved ; so nearly was the whole island in the possession of these desolating invaders ; that the Danes were at once on every coast, and in almost every part of the centre of the island : they are at once burning Lindisfarne, and fighting a great battle in Devonshire. At one time they have possession of Canterbury, Rochester, and London ; at other times of Winchester, Exeter, York, Nottingham, Reading, Chippenham in Wiltshire, Cambridge.¹ Their numbers were so magnified by the terrors of the people,

¹ See in Depping the plunder of Croyland, Medhamstead, Ely, and Coldingham, p. 141 ; Asser, p. 29.

that if 30,000 are reported as killed in one day, they are said to be succeeded the next by double the number. The churches and the monasteries were the chief objects of Danish enmity and spoliation, no doubt, as in France, from their wealth and defencelessness; they were the only places which offered rich and easy booty. Even the religious enthusiasm of the people was cowed, and almost extinct under these incessant persecutions. Its most popular and prevailing impulse, that which, in other countries, had seemed only to grow stronger in times of public calamity, the eagerness for a monastic life, had died away. When Alfred wished to found two monasteries, one for men at Athelney, one for females at Shaftesbury, he found not a single free or noble person disposed to be a monk or nun.¹ He was obliged to assemble them from all orders and all parts — some from beyond the sea, especially from France — there was one Pagan, Asser significantly says, “not the last.”

Alfred felt no security until he had compelled his enemies to Christianity; this was the one end and assurance of victory. The first fruits of his great triumph at Eddington was the baptism of Guthrun with thirty of his chieftains.² This was the only A.D. 879. guarantee for their faith — a precarious guarantee. This alone changed them from fierce and roving marauders to settled inhabitants of the land.

Alfred is no less memorable as preserving the close connexion between Christianity and civilization. It is difficult to understand how, after the long and total

¹ Asser, p. 61. “Nimirum, quia per multa retroacta annorum curricula monasticæ vitæ desiderium ab illâ totâ gente, necnon et a multis aliis gentibus funditus interierat.” Asser, among his reasons, gives one we should scarcely have expected, — the *wealth* of the nation.

² Page 35.

devastation of the kingdom by the Danes, Alfred could erect the buildings, pile up the castles, build the fleets, endow the churches and monasteries, if not schools, and send out the embassies, which might seem to demand more flourishing finances. He divided, it is said, his whole revenue into two parts ; one devoted to secular, the other to religious purposes.¹ The latter was subdivided into four ; one assigned to the poor, one to his monasteries of Athelney and Shaftesbury, one to the school which he had founded for his nobles, one for the monasteries of the rest of the kingdom, with occasional gifts to foreign religious houses.

Up to twelve years of age, Alfred, the favorite of his parents, and the best hunter in the Court, was ignorant of letters. His mother offered a richly-embellished volume of Saxon poetry to that one of her children who would learn to read it. Alfred, by divine inspiration (writes his biographer), and attracted by the beauty of the capital letters, immediately set about the task and won the prize. The love of letters was thus stamped upon his heart : he constantly carried in his bosom a book of psalms and prayers, which he read himself— a rare accomplishment, almost unrivalled in the whole kingdom of the West Saxons. His youthful prize may have suggested, or urged on him more strongly, the great work of Alfred : his powerful encouragement of the native Saxon literature, the identifica-

¹ Asser relates that when the king gave him the two monasteries of Amesbury and Banwell, he presented him with a silken pallium of great value, and as much incense as a strong man could carry ! This must have been a most costly gift ! — P. 50. Can we suppose that the Danes having plundered all the religious houses, there was great store of this, to them, useless commodity among the booty which Alfred recovered and could not restore to its lawful owners ?

tion of Christianity with the manners, language, poetry, not of a half Roman, but purely Teutonic race. Alfred delighted in all the old Saxon poems; he collected and caused to be recited Saxon books; and so, instead of being the religion of a learned priesthood, the Anglo-Saxon Christianity was familiarized and endeared to the people: it was a popular national faith. The knowledge of Latin, Alfred thought, would rather be promoted than discouraged by the translation of books into the vulgar tongue. It was a work of love in which he labored himself, not only from delight, but from want of assistants. In the whole land south of the Trent, there were few priests who could translate Latin into English; ¹ south of the Thames, at his accession, not one. What is more extraordinary, it was a religion which went back to the pure and primal sources of the faith—the sacred Scriptures. The poetry, the tradition of which Alfred continued from the monk Cædmon, was not a poetry exclusively of legend, of the lives and wonders of the Saints, but of the Sacred History thrown into the language and metre of Saxon poetry. It had its popular saints with their metrical lives; ² but its greatest poets had still reverted to the higher source of inspiration. Alfred, indeed, had not the high poetic gift of the older Cædmon. His works are those of the laborious man of learning, communicating the traditionary treasures of knowledge, which remained from the older civilization, to his Saxon subjects. King Alfred gave to Saxon England the Ecclesiastical History of Bede; the epitome of Augus-

¹ Præfatio ad Greg. Past., in Wise's Alfred, p. 87.

² See, on the poetry of Cædmon, above. Mr. Thorpe, in his curious volume from the Exeter Code, has a long poetical life of St. Guthlak, another of St. Juliana.

tine's great works by Orosius. He gave them the Consolation of Boëthius, and the Pastoral of St. Gregory. He summoned from all quarters men of learning. Asser came from St. David's, John of Saxony from the Abbey of Corbey; Archbishop Hincmar, of Rheims, sent Grimbald, Provost of St. Omer. The University of Oxford boasts, but on very doubtful authority, to owe her foundation to Alfred the Great.¹

¹ Compare Lingard, i. p. 179.

CHAPTER XI.

THE HUNGARIANS. DEGRADATION OF THE PAPACY.

IN the tenth century the few reflecting minds might not without reason apprehend the approaching dissolution of the world. A vast anarchy ^{Tenth century.} seemed to spread over Western Christendom. It is perhaps the darkest period in the history of every country in Europe. The Pagan Magyars, more terrible even than the Islamite Saracens, and the Pagan Northmen, now burst upon Europe. The ^{The Hungarians.} Arabs, who had swarmed from their deserts, wild marauders, had long become disciplined armies : Islam had become a mighty empire. The Caliphate maintained the show at least of ascendancy over the Sultanies of Africa and of Spain. Arabic was the language of whole regions, almost of continents. The Northmen, fierce pirates as they were, were of origin kindred to the Teutonic conquerors of France. Both Saracens and Northmen acknowledged some rude laws of war. But the Magyars, or Hungarians, seemed as hordes of savages or of wild beasts let loose upon mankind.¹ They burst unexpectedly upon Christendom in swarms of which the source seemed unknown and inexhaustible. Indiscriminate massacre seemed their only war law ; they were bound by no treaties, respected no

¹ Gibbon, ch. lv. vol. x. pp. 193-209.

boundaries. Civilization, Christianity, withered before their hosts, who were magnified by panic into misshapen monsters, and cannibals who fed on human flesh. Their language, of the Finnish stock, was akin to no known tongue. In those days of disorder and anarchy in Christendom, it is almost incredible that a single race, even if it swept with them many of the tribes who lay on the borders of civilization, Slavians and Bulgarians, could have so completely covered Europe, as to range over the whole of Germany; burn nearly at the same time, Bremen on the Baltic, and the monastery of St. Gall, near the lake of Constance; overrun Southern France, and menace the kingdoms beyond the Pyrenees. They rushed down the Alps, Italy lay open before them. Splendid Pavia, with its forty-three churches, was in ashes. Everywhere the walls of the cities were hastily repaired. Special litanies resounded in all the churches of Italy which escaped their ravages, for protection against the Hungarians. Rome beheld at no great distance the flame of their devastation; they spread to the very extremity of the peninsula.¹ The Hungarians for half a century were the common terror of Christendom, from their first irruption about A.D. 884, to A.D. 936, the date of the first great victory of Henry the Fowler. Gradually the Magyars settled down on the limits of modern Hungary. At the beginning of the next century Christian-

¹ The Chronic. Wurz. sub ann. 938, sums up their ravages: "Ungarii Franciam, Alemanniam, Galliam, usque oceanum et Burgundiam devastantes per Italiam redierunt, monasteria S. Galli et S. Bonifacii cremantur." The chronicles of almost every monastery — and a great number of monasteries in all quarters had their chronicle — record the losses, ruin, and desolation inflicted by these terrible strangers. — Apud Pertz, ii. p. 241, &c. Compare Liutprand, Lib. ii. in init. One of Muratori's dissertations describes their ravages in Italy.

ity had entirely subdued them, and with a kind of prophetic wisdom had arrayed this valiant nation as a future outguard against the Mohammedan Turks; their King Stephen was a Saint.

Cast a rapid glance over Christendom during these disastrous invasions of Saracens, Normans, Hungarians.

In England, though the wise institutions of Alfred, and now and then a king, like Athelstan, of more commanding character, maintained some State of Western Christendom. social order, almost the whole period was an England. uninterrupted war with the Danes. The Church was distracted by the implacable contests between the secular and regular clergy. In France the Carlovingian race was expiring, almost in the same state of imbecility and powerlessness as the Merovingians whom they supplanted. Towards the close of this period the new race of the Capets rose to the throne, the first purely French Dynasty. The Normans were now in settled possession of a great province in the kingdom.

The Empire alone displayed occasional vigor, rather from the commanding character of Henry Germany. the Fowler, the first conqueror of the Magyars, of Otho the Great and his descendants, than from the Imperial power itself. The legitimate descent from Charlemagne had expired in Louis III., the illegitimate in Arnulf. The imperial crown had passed from Italy, and back to Germany. It had become an Elective Sovereignty, as yet with no established rule or form of election, and had been for a short time absolutely suspended: it resumed its greatness under the House of Saxony.

But the deepest abasement, or rather almost annihilation, had already fallen on the Papacy. It- Abasement of the Papacy. aly, which for a time pretended to the Empire,

without a native prince of sufficient power or dignity to maintain its influence, constantly summoning new sovereigns from beyond the Alps to assume that perilous honor, until the right of election was resumed by Germany, was one battle-field of small contending princes, each endeavoring to form or to aggrandize an hereditary principality. The terror of the Hungarians increased at once the confusion, and, by compelling the more strong and artificial fortification of the cities, tended to their more complete isolation. Each city became an independent government; each chieftain aspired to be a sovereign. This anarchy of Italy led to the degradation of the Papacy, the degradation of the Papacy increased the anarchy of Italy. So insignificant is the Pope become, that it is almost as difficult to trace now for a long period, as afterwards at the close of the century, the regular succession. The Pope steals unnoticed into his dignity, and departs from it as unregarded; or rather is suddenly thrust into the throne by some act of violence, and as suddenly dispossessed by means as violent.

To none in the Christian world seems to have occurred the extraordinary anomaly, the election of a spiritual monarch for Christendom (for so he was esteemed in the West) by a body neither in character nor in general esteem representing the community. A single city aspired to nominate the universal Bishop; but that city was Rome; and Europe was resolutely ignorant what strange accidents, caprices, crimes, intrigues, even assassinations determined the rise and fall of the Supreme Pontiff. It is a memorable instance of the vital power of names, that the Christian world so long assented, without protest, apparently

Undetermined form
of election.

without consciousness of wrong, to the pretensions not only of the clergy but of the nobles and people of Rome, and whatever soldiery, either Roman or foreign, might command the city, to be the electors of the spiritual autocrat. The assent of the Emperor, at first of the East through the Exarch of Ravenna, afterwards of Charlemagne and his descendants (in theory at least esteemed necessary for the consecration of the Supreme Pontiff), had given to the world, or rather to Latin Christendom, some control over, at least some concurrence in, the election. But the Empire itself was now in abeyance. Italy now asserted her independence, forming a separate political system, with an elective king, and a number of dukes, counts, and princes, who recognized only when forcibly compelled, the supreme authority. At this inauspicious time the absolute election of the Pope reverted to this ill-organized democracy, or, as it were, to these conflicting democracies. Whoever now obtained the mastery of Rome by any means of violence, intrigue, or faction, the neighboring prince, the demagogue, the rude soldier, or the daring woman, nominated the head of Christendom. The Pope was himself one of those violent or licentious men, or an insignificant personage only performing the religious functions of his office, and holding his office, even his life, at the will of this shifting but perpetual tyranny.

On the other hand, the authority of the Pope, if not in the nomination — in the coronation of the Emperor — if it entangled him too inextricably in secular affairs, had given great dignity to his position. This continued so long as the Empire passed in a direct line down the descendants of Charlemagne. But even already, as

soon as the claim had come to be contested, the Pope, with not power enough to be the arbiter, sank into the partisan of one of the contending factions. Rome, become the centre of this strife, added to her own conflicting parties, that of rival Kings struggling for the Empire. Already the Pope had to choose between the dynasties of France and Germany or Italy. Each interest maintained its hired or devoted partisans in Rome, either thwarting or urging the Pope to hostile measures against its adversaries; at the time of each election to the Popedom exciting or maddening the contest. The Papal throne, even before it had assumed the power of awarding thrones and dictating to mankind, had been an object of fierce, or at times of sanguinary strife; and all these foreign and political influences exasperated the wild collision of personal conflict. While all around were lawless chieftains, ready to interfere with or without cause, to espouse any interest, and to aggrandize or enrich themselves at the expense of the metropolis of Christendom.

This iron age, as it has been called, opened with the Pontificate of Benedict IV.,¹ the successor of John IX. The only act recorded of Benedict IV., was the coronation² of the unfortunate Louis of Provence, the competitor of Berengar for the empire. Louis according to Imperial usage, set up his tribunal, and adjudged causes at Rome.

On the death of Benedict, the prudent precautions established by John IX., to introduce some regularity and control over the anarchy of an election by a clergy rent into factions, by a lawless nobility, and still more

¹ July, A.D. 900; died, 903, Aug.

² 901, Feb. Boehmer, regesta.

lawless people, during this utter helplessness and the abeyance, or the strife for the empire between rival princes, fell into utter neglect, or impotency. The Papacy became the prize of the most active, daring, and violent. Leo V. won the prize; before A.D. 903.

two months he was ejected and thrown into prison¹ by Christopher, one of his own presbyters and chaplains. The same year, or early in the next, Christopher was in his turn ignominiously driven from Rome.

Sergius had already once if not twice, at the accession of John IX.,² or at that of Formosus, or at both periods, contested the Papal chair. On his discomfiture he had taken refuge at the Court of the powerful counts of Tuscany; and there sat watching, with a band of devoted partisans, the rapid revolutions in Rome.

This great marquissate, or county of Tuscany, which for a long period exercised so vast an influence for evil or for good, had gradually risen to its enormous power and wealth: power which for many years ruled Rome and the Papacy; wealth which at length, through the munificence of the celebrated Countess Matilda, its descendant through another line, was hereafter to be the strength and support of the Popes in the days of their most exorbitant authority.

The descent of these hereditary Counts of Lucca, and Marquises or Dukes of Tuscany, is clearly traced from Boniface, who held that rank during the later years of Charlemagne. Adalbert was the grandson of Boniface, through a father of the same name. Adalbert

¹ "Emigrat ante suum quam luna bis impleat orbem."

Flodoard, de Pontif. Rom. apud Mabillon, Acta S. S. Benedict

² "Culmen apostolicæ sedis is jure paterno

Electus tenuit, ut Theodorus obit,

Joannes subit."

Epitaph in Pagi, sub ann. 910.

had been among those powerful princes, whose claims to beneficiary rights had excited the jealous resentment of the Emperor Louis the Pious. He had been imprisoned, and though soon released, had sworn to avenge the indignity on the first opportunity. Adalbert II., the son of Adalbert I., was so surpassingly wealthy (and wealth in those times was power) that he was called the Rich. His influence, as well as his ambition, was increased by his marriage with Bertha, daughter of the King Lothair, by his wife or concubine, Waldrada, and widow of the King of Provence. This haughty woman was

A.D. 900. mother, by her first husband, of Hugh of Provence, afterwards King of Italy, and Emperor. The counsels of his imperious wife led Adalbert into a premature rebellion against Lambert, then Emperor, and King of Italy. The Tuscan was defeated ignominiously, and thrown into prison. He had been taken in a stable.¹ Lambert insulted him by saying, "Your haughty wife Bertha prophesied that you would be a king or an ass; lo, you are found like an ass in the stalls among the cattle!" The death of Lambert, by accident or assassination, released Adalbert from his captivity, and restored him to his power. From this time the fate of Italy seemed to depend upon his will. The fickle Italians, weary of the rule of Berengar, who on the death of Lambert had become undisputed pos-

A.D. 900. sessor of the empire, invited Louis of Provence, the son of Count Boso, and Ermengard, daughter of the Emperor Louis of Germany, to assume the throne of Italy and the empire. Adalbert at first maintained the cause of Berengar (his fidelity was secured by ample gifts), and Louis was obliged to retreat beyond the Alps.

¹ Liutprand, ii. 38.

But the ambitious Bertha alienated the mind of her husband from Berengar.¹ Adalbert joined in a second invitation to Louis. Berengar, when he found the Tuscans among his enemies, shut himself up in Verona, which he was obliged to surrender to the victorious Louis. The new Emperor and King of Italy was crowned in Rome.² On his return he visited Lucca, where the indiscreet Emperor beheld with astonishment, alarm, and envy, the state, and the formidable and well-appointed forces of Adalbert. He dropped the incautious expression, "This is no marquis, but a king." From that moment the throne of Louis was lost. Bertha organized an extensive revolt of the Italian provinces. Louis allowed himself to be surprised in Verona by Berengar, who revenged himself by putting out the eyes of his rival.

It was under the protection of this powerful Tuscan that the exiled Sergius, at the head of a strong force of Tuscan soldiers, appeared in Rome, deposed Christopher,³ who had just deposed Leo V., and took possession of the Papal throne.

Sergius had been seven years an exile in A.D. 897-904. Tuscany; for seven years he ruled as supreme, but not undisputed, Pontiff. This Pope has been A.D. 904-911. loaded with every vice and every enormity which can blacken the character of man.⁴ Yet as to his reign

¹ "Bellua Tyrrhenis fundens fera sibila ab oris
Solicitat Rhodani gentem."

Panegy. Berengar. iv.

² 901. I follow Muratori's course of events.

³ Christopher consecrated Oct. 903; deposed, and becomes a monk, Jan. 904.

⁴ "Sergius inde redit, dudum, qui lectus ad arcem
Culminis, exsilio tulerat rapiente repulsam,
Quo profugus latuit Septem volventibus annis.
Hinc populi remeans precibus sacratur honore

there is almost total obscurity. The only certain act which has transpired is his restoration of the Lateran palace, which had fallen into ruins ; an act which indicates a period of comparative peace and orderly administration, with the command of a large revenue.¹ In these violent times Sergius probably scrupled at no violence ; but if he drove a Pope from the throne of St. Peter, that Pope had just before deposed his patron, and with great cruelty.²

But during the Papacy of Sergius rose into power the infamous Theodora, with her daughters Marozia and Theodora, the prostitutes who, in the strong language of historians, disposed for many years of the Papal tiara, and not content with disgracing by their own licentious lives the chief city of Christendom, actually placed their profligate paramours or base-born sons in the chair of St. Peter. The influence obtained by Theodora and her daughters, if it shows not the criminal connivance of Pope Sergius, or a still more disgraceful connection with which he was charged by the scandal of the times, proves at least the utter degradation of the Papal power in Rome. It had not only lost all commanding authority, but could not even maintain outward decency. Theodora was born of a noble and wealthy senatorial family, on whom she has entailed an infamous immortality. The women of Rome seem at successive periods seized with a kind of Roman ambi-

Pridem adsignato, quo nomine Tertius exit
Antistes, Petri eximiâ quo cede recepto
Præsule gaudet ovans annis Septem amplius orbis."

Flodoard de Rom. Pontif

¹ Mabillon, in *Appendic. ad Ord. Roman.* Muratori, sub ann. 907.

² See also the epitaph on Sergius apud Muratori, A.D. 911. Yet even Sergius is regulating the affairs and granting the pallium to an archbishop of Hamburg. — Jaffé, *Regesta*, p. 308.

tion to surpass their sex by the greatness of their virtues and of their vices. These females were to the Paulas and Eustochiums of the younger and severer age of Roman Christianity, what the Julias and Messalinas of the Empire were to the Volumnias and Cornelias of the Republic.¹

It must be acknowledged, that if the stern language of Tacitus and Juvenal may have darkened the vices of the queens and daughters of the Cæsars, the Bishop of Cremona, our chief authority on the enormities of Theodora and her daughters, wants the moral dignity, while he is liable to the same suspicion as those great writers. Throughout the lives of the Pontiffs themselves we have to balance between the malignant license of satire and the unmeaning phrases of adulatory panegyric.² On the other hand it is difficult to decide which is more utterly unchristian: the profound hatred which

¹ The devout indignation of Baronius, as to these times, arose no doubt in great part from the severe but honest asceticism of his character, and his horror at this violation of his high notions of sacerdotal sanctity by what appeared to him far more unseemly and unpardonable criminality than arrogance, avarice, or cruelty. His fears, too, lest he should be accused of an immoral partiality by the slightest extenuation, or even by a dispassionate examination of such vices, has led him to exaggerate rather than soften the monstrous enormities of those times. And the happy thought, happy in a thorough-going controversialist, that the deeper the degradation of the Papacy, the more wonderful, and therefore the more manifestly of God, its restoration to power, removed every remaining repugnance to his abandonment of all the popes during the tenth century to historical infamy. The passage is too well known and too long for citation. Muratori, who had some new authorities, is more temperate, especially as to the character of Sergius.

² Liutprand is the chief, the only authority on which Baronius rests. Muratori inclines to the Panegyrist of Berengarius, who gives a high character of John X., and to Flodoard; but the poet's language consists merely of the common phrases applied to all popes, who are, according to some writers, *ex officio* endowed with certain virtues. and Pope John had just acknowledged the title, and entered into close alliance with the object of the poet's panegyric.

could invent or accredit such stories; the utter dissoluteness which made them easily believed; or the actual truth of such charges.

Liutprand relates that John, afterwards the tenth Theodora. Pope of that name, being employed in Rome on some ecclesiastical matters by the Archbishop of Ravenna, was the paramour of Theodora,¹ who not only allowed, but compelled him to her embraces. John John X. was first appointed to the see of Bologna; but the archbishopric of Ravenna, the second ecclesiastical dignity in Italy, falling vacant before he had been consecrated, he was advanced by the same dominant influence to that see.² But Theodora bore with impatience the separation of two hundred miles from her lover.

Sept. 911. Anastasius III. had succeeded Sergius, and
Nov. 913. occupied the Papacy for rather more than
May, 914. two years; after him Lando for six months.
John X. On the death of Lando, by a more flagrant
May 15, 914. violation of the canonical rule than that charged against the dead body of Formosus, John was translated from the archiepiscopate of Ravenna to the see of Rome. But Theodora, if she indeed possessed this dictatorial

¹ "Theodora, . . . quod dictu etiam fœdissimum est, Romanæ civitatis non invirilliter monarchiam obtinebat." — Liutprand.

² Muratori has suggested a most serious objection to the story of Liutprand. That author says that the translation of John from Ravenna to Rome took place "modicâ temporis intercapedine," after his appointment to Ravenna. There is strong evidence for supposing John to have been Archbishop of Ravenna from 905 to 914, a long period for such a passion as Theodora's to endure delay. Are we to suppose that, though Archbishop of Ravenna, he resided at Rome? "Joannes Archiepiscopus Ravennatis ecclesiæ, incitatus a primatibus Romanæ urbis, contra instituta canonum, agens, Romanæ ecclesiæ invasor factus." — Chronic. S. Benedict. apud Pertz. Compare Chron. Mon. Cass. apud Pertz, Liutprand. "Theodoræ autem glycerii mens perversa, Ravennatem hunc præsulatum coegit deserere, Romanumque, pro nefas! summum pontificium usurpare." — c. 48.

power, and the clergy and people of Rome, if they yielded to her dictation, may have been actuated by nobler and better motives than her gratification of a lustful passion, if not by motives purely Christian. For however the Archbishop of Ravenna might be no example of piety or holiness as the spiritual head of Christendom, he appears to have been highly qualified for the secular part of his office. He was a man of ability and daring, eminently wanting at this juncture to save Rome from becoming the prey of Mohammedan conquest. The Saracens occupied a strong fortress on the Garigliano,¹ which, while it secured their own southern conquests, constantly threatened the dukedoms beyond their border. The whole domain or territory of St. Peter lay at their mercy. They commanded, and could interrupt almost all communication with the South of Italy. The pilgrims could not reach the shrines of the apostles without being plundered, maltreated, often made prisoners, and obliged to ransom themselves at enormous prices.

The Pontiff placed himself at the head of a powerful confederacy of the neighboring dukes, who were either awed or persuaded into a league for mutual defence: it comprehended Landulf, the Duke of Benevento and Capua, the Dukes of Spoleto and Camerina. But a stronger effort was necessary. It was determined to demand the aid of the two Emperors, those of the West and of the East, in the common cause of Christendom. Constantine, the Emperor of the East, promised naval succors. Berengar was now undisputed Emperor of the West; he

March 24, 916.
Coronation of
the Emperor
Berengar.

¹ The poet calls this fortress the "vicina Charybdis," which swallowed up all the wealth of Rome. — De Laudib. Berengar.

accepted the invitation, and went in person to Rome. His poetical panegyrist has left a glowing description of his power, and the magnificence of his reception. He was met by the Senate with their banners, which represented the heads of wild beasts. They sang his praises in their Latin or Italian tongue. The Senate was followed by the schools of strangers, the Greek among the rest, who each paid their homage to the Emperor in their native dialect. The nobles were represented by Peter, the brother of the Pope, and the son of Theophylact, called by the poet the Consul of Rome. The Popes were accustomed to receive the Emperors standing on the top of the steps leading up to St. Peter's. Latterly they had assumed the more dignified attitude of remaining seated. The Emperor rode the Pope's white horse, according to usage.¹ He ascended the steps, was received and saluted by the Pope with a kiss. After the Emperor had sworn to maintain the privileges and possessions of the Church, they entered the church hand in hand, the Pope chanting the service. The Emperor knelt and worshipped at the tomb of St. Peter, and was afterwards received at a splendid banquet by the Pope. The coronation and anointing took place the day after Easter-day. The donations of Pepin and Charlemagne were read, with all the domains granted to the successor of St. Peter, as a warning lest any robber should presume to usurp those sacred lands.² But the Pope was

¹ "Evectus Pastoris equo, mox quippe sacerdos
Ipse futurus erat, titulo res digna perenni."

See the note of Valesius. There seems to have been some symbolical meaning which is far from clear. Does it imply that the Emperor, by being anointed, assumed a sacerdotal character?

² "Leetit Augusti concessos munere pagos,
Præsulis obsequio gradibus stans lector in altis,
Cæsare quo norint omnes data munera, prædo
Ulterius paveat sacras sibi sumere terras."

not content with his legitimate influence, in organizing this great league for the preservation, if not of Christendom, at least of Rome, from the unbelievers. He placed himself at the head of the army, and for the first time the successor of St. Peter, the vicar of the Prince of Peace, rode forth in his array to battle. And, if success, as it doubtless was, might be interpreted as a manifestation of Divine approval, the total discomfiture of the Saracens, and the destruction of the troublesome fortress on the Garigliano, seemed to sanction Aug. 11, 916. this new and unseemly character assumed by the Pope. Even the Apostles sanctioned or secured by their presence the triumph of the warlike Pope.¹

For fourteen years, obscure as regards Rome and the Pontificate, this powerful prelate occupied the A.D. 914-928. See of Rome. If he gained it (a doubtful charge) by the vices and influence of the mother, Theodora, he lost it, together with his life, by the no less flagrant vices, and more monstrous power, of the daughter, Marozia.

Theodora disappears; and Pope John X. is found engaged in a fierce contest for the mastery of Rome with Marozia and her lover or husband, the Marozia. Marquis Alberic,² by whom she had a son of the same name, afterwards tyrant of the city. The vigorous and martial Pontiff succeeds in expelling Alberic from the city; Alberic probably met his death soon A.D. 925. after. It is said that he was murdered by the Romans

¹ "A religiosis fidelibus visi sunt in eodem bello sanctissimi Petrus et Paulus apostoli." — Liutprand, c. 54.

² Muratori has clearly proved the mistake, or perhaps false reading, in Liutprand, followed by Baronius and others. The lover of Marozia was not and could not be Adalbert the Rich, the Duke of Tuscany, the husband of the imperious Bertha, and the protector of Sergius. Adalbert does not seem to have been at Rome. The lover of Marozia was Alberic, Marquis (Marchio) perhaps of Camerina.

in revenge for some secret alliance entered into with the Hungarians, who were then wasting Italy, and had reached the very frontiers of Calabria.

The death of her husband increased rather than weakened the power of Marozia. Her personal charms, and her unscrupulous use of them, are said to have multiplied to an infinite extent her adherents. Her paramours made a strong party. The Empire was vacant. There was no potentate to whom the Pope could appeal. Marozia seized the castle of St. Angelo, and with this precious dowry, which commanded Rome, she sought to confirm her power by some splendid alliance. Guido, the Duke of Tuscany, the son of Adalbert the Marquis, did not disdain the nuptials with a profligate woman, who brought Rome as her marriage portion.

During the rapid and bloody revolutions of the few last years in Italy, this house of Tuscany had maintained its greatness. Soon after the death of Adalbert the Rich, the widow Bertha, and Guido her son, plunged into their quarrel with the Emperor Berengar, then at the height of his power; they had been imprisoned, but speedily obtained their release, and recovered all their wealth and power. Bertha had extended her influence by the marriage of her daughter, Ermen-gard, a woman of unprincipled ambition, worthy of her mother, with Adalbert, the Marquis of Ivrea, whose first wife had been a daughter of the Emperor Berengar, and who was the most powerful of the northern princes.

The murder of Berengar (who died unpitied,¹ for in
A.D. 922. his last contest with the new usurper of the

¹ Liutprand, c. 61.

empire, Rodolf of Burgundy, he had made a treaty with the terrible Hungarians, now the scourge of the North, as the Saracens were of the South) had made the empire vacant, and threw the whole north of Italy into the utmost confusion. Ermengard, now a widow, and if Liutprand is to be credited, of unscrupulous license, not with princes only, but even with ignoble men,¹ became the object and the promotress of all the intrigues, feuds, and murders, on account of the kingdom of Italy.

The strife ended with the descent into Italy of Hugh of Provence, the son of Bertha by her first husband, and so half brother to Guido of ^{Hugh of Pro-} ^{vence.} Tuscany. Hugh of Provence, the new competitor for the kingdom of Italy and the Empire, landed at Pisa. This crafty Prince fully estimated the influence of the clergy in the politics of Italy. He affected the most profound zeal for religion. He was a man, for his day, of many accomplishments, and sought the society of those whom Liutprand dignifies by the name of philosophers. Liutprand himself, the future historian, ambassador at Constantinople and Bishop of Cremona, was brought up as a page in the court of Hugh of Provence; and though his unbounded licentiousness as to women could not but offend the pious ecclesiastic, the courtly historian touches with great tenderness the other vices, not by any means the lightest, of his royal patron.

The clergy of Italy, flattered by the homage, hailed the landing of Hugh at Pisa, as the restoration of an age of peace and piety. Lanthbert, Archbishop of Milan, was his ardent partisan, and hastened to meet him

¹ "Carnale cum non solum principibus, verum etiam ignobilibus, commercium exercebat." — iii. 7.

at Pavia. The Pope himself, notwithstanding the connexion of Hugh with the husband of Marozia, hoped, perhaps, with the prize of the Imperial crown, to secure his protection against his domestic tyrants. He went July 19, 926. to meet the king at Mantua: a treaty was entered into, but the conditions are unknown.

The last hopes, however, of foreign protection were vain. John X. was left to contest alone the government of Rome with Marozia and her Tuscan husband. Neither Rome, nor the mistress of Rome, regarded the real services rendered by John X. to Christendom and to Italy. The former lover, as public scandal averred, of her mother, the saviour of Rome from the Saracens, was surprised in the Lateran palace by this daring woman. His brother Peter, as it appears, his great support in the contest for the government of Rome, and therefore the object of peculiar hatred to Guido and Marozia, was killed before his face. The Pope was thrown into prison, where some months after he died, either of anguish and despair, or by more summary means. It was rumored that he was smothered with a pillow. No means were too violent for Marozia to employ even against a Pope.¹

Marozia did not venture at once to place her son on the Papal throne. A Leo VI. was Pope for some months; a Stephen VII. for two years and one month. That son may as yet have been too young even for this shameless woman to advance him to the highest ecclesiastical dignity; her husband Guido may have had some lingering respect for the sacred

Death of
John X.

A.D. 928.

A.D. 929.

July, 928.

Feb. 929.

March, 931.

¹ Flodoard, Annal. 929; Liutprand, iii. 43; Annal. Benevent. "Moritur Papa Johannes in castro jugulatus."

office, some struggling feelings of decency. But at the death of Stephen, Marozia again ruled alone in Rome ; her husband Guido was dead, and her son was March, 931.

Pope. John XI. (according to the rumors of the time, of which Liutprand, a follower of Hugh of Provence, may be accepted as a faithful reporter) was the offspring of Marozia by the Pope Sergius : more trustworthy authorities make him the lawful son of her husband Alberic. But the obsequious clergy and people acquiesced without resistance in the commands of their patrician mistress ; the son of Marozia is successor of St. Peter.

But the aspiring Marozia, not content with having been the wife of a Marquis, the wife of the wealthy and powerful Duke of Tuscany ; perhaps the mistress of one, certainly the mother of another Pope, looked still higher in her lustful ambition ; she must wed a monarch. She sent to offer herself and the city of Rome to the new King of Italy.

Hugh of Provence was not scrupulous in his amours, lawful or unlawful. Through policy or through passion, he was always ready to form or to break these tender connections.

*Marriage of
Marozia with
Hugh of Pro-
vence.*

Yet there was an impediment, a canonical impediment, to this marriage, which even Hugh and Marozia dared not despise. Guido, the late husband of Marozia, and Hugh of Provence, were sons of the same mother. Even the Levitical law, which seems to have occurred to some, would not assist them,¹ for Marozia had borne

¹ Liutprand interlards his history with verses : —

“ Hæc tibi Moyseos non præstant carmina vates
Qui fratri sobolem fratris de nomine jussit
Edere, si primus nequeat sibi gignere natum,
Nostra tuo peperisse viro te sæcula norunt,
Respondes scio, tu, sed non Venus ebria curat.”

children to Guido.¹ Hugh struck out a happy expedient, at the same time to get over this difficulty, to be master of Rome, and to enable himself to fulfil the other great object of his ambition, the seizure of the Tuscan Dukedom. Truth, justice, and the interests of her late husband's family, were alike insignificant in the eyes of Marozia. Lambert, a man of courage and character, had succeeded his brother Guido in the dukedom. Hugh of Provence began by disseminating rumors that Bertha had no children by her husband Adalbert; that Guido, Lambert, and Ermengard, were all supposititious, and imposed on the weak Adalbert by his crafty wife as his own. Lambert had adopted that last strange resource, so imposing and convincing in those days, in order to vindicate his father's wisdom, his mother's honor, and his own legitimacy. He offered the wager of battle to any champion appointed by the King of Italy. A brave and youthful warrior was chosen. Lambert came off victorious. Foiled in this attempt, King Hugh contrived to seize Lambert by treachery, and to put out his eyes. The rich inheritance and the power of Tuscany passed without resistance to Boso, brother of Hugh. Successful crime made Hugh of Provence only more welcome to Marozia. The King of Italy drew near to Rome: the cautious Marozia would not allow his army to enter the city, but received her royal bridegroom in the castle of St. Angelo. There was celebrated this unhallowed marriage.²

¹ These children probably died early; nothing is heard of them.

² "Advenit optatus ceu bos tibi ductus ad aram
Rex Hugo, Romanam potius commotus ob urbem,
Quid juvat, o scelerata, virum sic perdere sanctum."

The sanctity of King Hugo! The naïveté of Liutprand is truly comic, betraying the motive, the possession of Rome, for this sacrifice!

But the Romans would brook the dominion of a Roman woman, they would not endure that of a foreigner. The coarse vices, the gluttony of the soldiers of Hugh, offended the fastidious Italians. The insolence of Hugh himself provoked a rebellion. The nobles were called upon to perform menial offices, usual probably in the half-feudal ^{Rebellion of Rome.}

Transalpine courts, but alien to Italian manners. Alberic, the son of Marozia, was commanded to hold the water in which King Hugh washed his hands. Performing his office awkwardly or reluctantly, he spilled the water, and received a blow on the face from the king. Already may Alberic have been jealous- Alberic.

ous of the promotion of his brother to the popedom, and have resented this devotion of his mother to her new foreign connections. He was a youth of daring; he organized a conspiracy among the nobles of Rome; he appealed to the old Roman pride, — “Shall these Burgundians, of old the slaves of Rome, tyrannize over Romans?”¹ At the tolling of the bell the ^{A.D. 932.}

whole people flocked to his banner, and attacked the castle of St. Angelo before Hugh could admit his own troops. Alberic remained master of the Castle, of his mother, and of the Pope. These two he cast into prison, defied the king of Italy, who made an ignominious retreat, and from that time remained master of Rome.²

For four years Pope John XI. lingered in fact a prisoner, at least without any share in the government

¹ Liutprand. This loose writer, and Flodoard, whose adulatory phrases on the virtues and wisdom of each successive pope remind us of the proverbial mendacity of epitaphs, are still almost our sole authorities.

² Flodoard, in Chron. apud Duchesne.

of Rome, only permitted to perform his spiritual functions. Alberic ruled undisturbed. King Hugh attempted to bribe him to the surrender of Rome, by the offer of his daughter in marriage; the more crafty Alberic married the daughter, and retained possession of Rome. After the death of John, a succession of Popes, appointed, no doubt, by the sole will of Alberic, — Leo VII., Stephen IX., Marinus II., Agapetus II., pass over the throne of the Popedom, with hardly a sign of their power in Rome, no indication of their dignity, still less of their sanctity. They are still Popes beyond the Alps.¹

Papal succession.

Leo, Jan. 936.

Stephen, 939.

Marinus, 941.

Agapetus, 946-956.

Nor was the supreme Pontiff alone depressed in these turbulent times. The great ecclesiastics of Italy are mingled up in most of the treacherous and bloody transactions of the period.² Individual energy gave the bishop of a city great power; but as they acted with as little restraint, so these prelates were treated with as little reverence as secular princes. Landulf of Capua, and Athanasius of Naples, have already appeared in that strangely mingled character of the lawless Italian prince and the Christian prelate. Lanthbert had bought the archbishopric of Milan, by large bribes, from the Emperor

Great ecclesiastics of Italy.

¹ Leo sends a bull to the Archbishop of Hamburg; appoints the Archbishop of Mentz his legate, with full power to correct bishops and monks; makes grants and issues laws. — *Regesta apud Jaffé*. Stephen interferes in France in favor of Louis d'Outre-mer. Marinus confirms the Archbishop of Mentz as his vicar. Agapetus, in a Council, condemns Hugh, Archbishop of Rheims.

² The obscenities which perpetually occur in the pages of the Bishop Liutprand betoken an age of profound corruption. The Italian character was now a strange fusion of lust and ferocity. The emasculation of their enemies was a common revenge.

Berengar. It was by his instrumentality that Burchard, Duke of Suabia, the father-in-law of King Rodolf of Burgundy, was surprised and murdered. Burchard, indeed, had given provocation; he had threatened to turn a church in the suburbs into a fortress, by which he would bridle the mutinous city of Milan.¹

Hugh of Provence, now undisputed King of Italy, though ejected from and baffled before Rome, ruled supreme in Pavia, where he built a splendid palace. Hugh, throughout his reign, showed the utmost scorn of ecclesiastical as of moral control. He had violated the law of marriage by his union with Marozia; as soon as he found it convenient he declared that marriage null, and married Alda, the daughter of King Lothair. On her death he again wedded Bertha, widow A.D. 938. of King Rodolf of Burgundy, and in contempt of the canon law, united her daughter to his son. No stern or ascetic prelate ventured to rebuke the promiscuous concubinage with which the King of Italy still further outraged public decency. He bestowed the great bishoprics according to his caprice. One of his bastards he made Bishop of Piacenza, another Archdeacon, or one of the Cardinals, with the hope of succession to the archbishopric of Milan.² Hilduin, his relation, expelled from his see in France, was raised to the archbishopric of Milan. Ratherius, a French monk, on account of his skill in the seven liberal arts, was made

¹ Compare Verri, *Storia di Milano*, c. iii. p. 99, for the insulting language of Burchard, whom the Archbishop had honored with the especial privilege of allowing him to hunt a stag in his park. Burchard expressed at once his admiration and contempt at the height and strength of the walls of Milan.

² Liutprand, iv. 6. Teobaldo, his bastard by Stephanía, a Roman concubine of King Hugh. Verri, p. 101. Hugh formed a plot for the murder of Alderic, the Archbishop; it was baffled.

Bishop of Verona ; this was contrary to the inclination of Hugh, who declared that Ratherius should bitterly lament his elevation. He cut him off with a very small stipend, and forced him to take an oath not to lay claim to any more of the revenues of the Church.¹ On the seizure of Verona by Arnulf, Duke of Bavaria, who aspired for a short time to the empire, Ratherius, accused of favoring the usurper, was seized, deposed, and imprisoned at Pavia. Manasseh, Archbishop of Arles, the ungrateful favorite of Hugh, had been permitted to swallow up the bishoprics of Trent, Verona, and Mantua. This ambitious prelate, tempted by the higher offer of the archbishopric of Milan,² on the first opportunity, sought to betray his patron. He was master of the March of Trent, and, as Bishop, commanded the pass of the Alps. This pass he surrendered to Berengar, Marquis of Ivrea, when he rose to supplant King Hugh in the dominion of Italy. Monasticism too was now at its lowest ebb. King Hugh granted the lands of abbeys, and even abbeys, like other lands, to his flatterers or his servants.³

Italy, which was soon weary of better kings, began to take steps for relieving herself of the oppressions of King Hugh. Conspiracies were formed with Transalpine sovereigns to contest the kingdom of Italy, first with Rodolf of Burgundy, whom Hugh

Conspiracy
against King
Hugh.

¹ The writings of Ratherius in D'Achery, *Spicileg.* i. and in Martene and Durand, are full of curious matter on his personal history and the state of the Church. He is strong against the universal marriage of the clergy, which he brands as adultery. D'Achery, i. 363.

² *Quum miles esse inciperet, episcopus esse desinit.* Thus writes Liutprand of Manasseh. Manasseh, in justification of his promotions, had profanely quoted to Liutprand the translation of St. Peter from Antioch to Rome. Liutprand, iii. 2.

³ Liutprand, iv. c. 3. Muratori, *Ann. d'Italia*, sub ann. 939.

bribed to peace by the surrender of part of his Provençal dominions. Then Arnulf, Duke of Bavaria, descended the Alps, and occupied Verona. He retreated with discomfiture and disgrace.

At length arose a more formidable rival. Berengar, Marquis of Ivrea, had married Willa, the daughter of Boso, King Hugh's brother, on whom the King had bestowed the dukedom of Tuscany. Jealous of his brother's wealth, and of certain splendid ornaments, in which Boso and his wife took great delight, Hugh despoiled his brother of the dukedom, which he then granted to one of his own bastards. Berengar had been suspected, with his brother Anschar Duke of Spoleto of dangerous designs against the King. Anschar took up arms and fell in battle. Berengar was then at the court of the king, who had determined to seize and blind him. Berengar received timely warning (it is said from Lothair, King Hugh's son, who reigned with conjoint authority), and fled beyond the Alps. There he remained till, almost summoned by the general discontent of the Italian princes, he descended the Alps as a deliverer. The great ecclesiastics were the first to desert the cause of King Hugh. Manasseh, on the promise of the archbishopric of Milan, opened Trent. Adelard, his officer, who commanded the fortress Fiumigara in that district, was rewarded for joining in his master's treason, by the promise of the bishopric of Como. Princes crowded around Berengar to obtain castles or domains, ecclesiastics monasteries or bishoprics. Berengar dispossessed the spiritual as unscrupulously as the temporal sovereigns. He expelled Joseph from the see of Brescia; he broke his promise of the see of Como to

A.D. 936.
Berengar,
Marquis of
Ivrea.

A.D. 940.

A.D. 945.

Adelard, and gave it to Waldo, a lawless robber, who plundered the highways, and blinded his captives; to Adelard he gave the see of Reggio. He was only prevented by large bribes from dispossessing the bishops of Parma and Piacenza. Guido, Bishop of Modena, had been gained to his party by the rich abbey of Nonantula.

Berengar was content to leave the title of King of Italy for a short time to Hugh and his son Lothair, while himself possessed the real power. Hugh, disgusted at this humiliation, speedily withdrew, with his enormous wealth, beyond the Alps, leaving the vain but perilous ensigns of royalty to his promising son. He died the year after his retirement. Lothair lingered on for three years in this inglorious kingly servitude, and died in the flower of his age, poisoned, as of course it was rumored, by Berengar — by Berengar, whose life he had saved from the plots of his own father, Hugh of Provence. Berengar and his son Adalbert became kings of Italy.

During the whole reign of Hugh of Provence, notwithstanding the open or treacherous assaults of that king, Alberic, whether as an armed tyrant, commanding Rome from the Castle of St. Angelo, or as the head of a republic, and recognised by the voice of the Roman people, had maintained his authority. He had ruled for twenty-two years; he bequeathed that authority, on his death, to his son Octavian.

Octavian, though only nineteen years old, aspired to unite, in his own person, the civil and spiritual supremacy. He was already in holy orders; two years after the death of his father Alberic, the Pope Agapetus II. died; and Octavian, by the voluntary or

Pope John
XII.
Nov. 965.

enforced suffrages of the clergy and the people, was elected Pope. He was the first of the Roman pontiffs who changed, or rather took a second ecclesiastical name; the civil government seems to have been conducted in that of Octavian; the Church was administered under that of John XII.

Berengar and his son Adalbert, kings of Italy, had made no attempt on Rome during the strong rule of Alberic. The youth of the new Governor and Pope tempted them to threaten the independence of the city, and to bring it within the sphere of their tyranny. Of that new tyranny Italy was now again weary. Berengar, his wife Willa, and his son Adalbert, are charged with acts of atrocious cruelty and oppression, in every part of their large dominions.

CHAPTER XII.

THE OTHOS ON THE IMPERIAL THRONE.

IN the mean time had arisen in Germany a monarch more powerful than had appeared in Europe since the death of Charlemagne. Otho the Great, of the Saxon line, had inherited a preponderating power in the North of Germany. He had greatly increased it by his own successes in war. The Danes, the Slavonians, the Hungarians, had been subdued by his arms, or awed by the terrors of his victorious forces. All Germany submitted to his sway, or acknowledged his superiority. Already, some years before, the formidable Otho had made a descent on Italy; but his expedition was more that of an adventurous Paladin of later days for the deliverance of a captive princess, than the invasion of a mighty sovereign. That princess had pretensions indeed to the kingdom of Italy. The beautiful Adelaide, the widow of King Lothair (the gallant but unfortunate son and heir of Hugh of Provence), had been cruelly persecuted after her husband's death, by Berengar, whose son Adalbert aspired to her hand. She had been stripped of all her jewels and costly raiment, beaten, her hair torn from her head, and plunged into a fœtid dungeon.¹ She made her escape, with the assistance

¹ So writes S. Odilo, Abbot of Clugny. — Vita S. Adelard. apud Canisium. Hroswitha de Gest. Oddon.

of a priest, and took refuge under the protection of the Bishop of Reggio. That prelate intrusted her to the care of his brother, who held the strong castle of Canosa, in fee of that Church. Canosa defied the siege of Berengar and Adalbert. Otho, whose son Lu-
A.D. 951.
 dolf had already made a descent, not brilliantly successful, upon Italy, suddenly swept down from the Alps, rescued and married the captive princess. Berengar was obliged to open the gates of Pavia to the irresistible Otho.

Otho made some disposition for a visit to Rome to receive the imperial crown from the hands of the Pope Agapetus; but Alberic would brook no master. The Pope at his dictation, declined to receive the dangerous stranger. Otho returned to Germany to suppress the menaced rebellion of his son Ludolf, who had taken offence at his father's second marriage. He was followed in the next year by Berengar and Adalbert, who stooped to receive the kingdom of Italy as vassals of the German Otho. They promised — no doubt the secret of their humiliation was the widespread discontent of their Italian subjects — to rule with greater
Augsburg, Aug. 7, A.D. 952.
 equity and moderation.¹ But for four years
 Otho was occupied with his German wars, civil wars against his sons, and wars against the Hungarians;² the tyranny of Berengar and his son Adalbert weighed on

¹ Hroswitha de Gestis Oddonis: —

“Hunc Regem certè digno suscepit honore,
 Restituens illi sublatis culmina Regni,
 Ista percortè tantum sub conditione.
 — seu subjectis jussis esset studiosus.

* * * * et

Ut post hæc populum regeret clementius ipsum
 Quem prius Imperio nimium contrivit amaro.”

² On these wars read Giesebrecht, *Deutsche Kaiserzeit*, Braunshweig, 1855.

the necks of his subjects with all its former burden. The son of Otho, Ludolf, who had returned to the allegiance of his father, was first despatched with a great army to the deliverance of Italy. After having overcome all resistance, Ludolf died, by one account slain in battle by the hand of King Adalbert, by another A.D. 957. poisoned through the agency of Berengar; more probably of a fever. Berengar and Adalbert, who had cowered before the irresistible enemy, resumed their sway, and their tyranny was aggravated by revenge. The cry was again loud and universal for the interposition of the Germans.

The Church by its prelates was the first and most urgent in its supplications to the Transalpine for deliverance from her Italian tyrants. The Pope John XII. (Octavian), menaced by Berengar, sent two ambassadors of high rank on this important mission. The Archbishop of Milan, who had been dispossessed to make room for Manasseh of Arles, and Waldo, the deprived Bishop of Como, joined in the appeal. Many of the Italian princes were equally impatient for succor.

All Italy looked for the coming of the new Charlemagne. On his appearance resistance vanished. Berengar and Adalbert shut themselves up in their strongest fortresses. It was a triumphal procession to Pavia—to Rome. At Pavia Otho the Great was A.D. 961-2. crowned King of Italy, at Rome the Pope Arrived at Rome Feb. anointed him as Emperor. Thenceforth the King of Germany claimed to be Western Emperor.¹

¹ Otho of Freisingen says of the Emperor Otho: "Imperium Romanum virtute suâ ad Francos orientales reduxit." — vi. 24.

"Quemcunque sibi Germania regem
Præfuit, hunc dives submisso vertice Roma
Suscepit." — *Gunther, in Ligur.*

Othó swore to protect the Church of Rome against all her enemies, to maintain her rights and privileges, to restore her lands and possessions, when he should have recovered them, and to make no change in the government of Rome without the sanction of the Pope. John XII. and the Roman people took the oath of allegiance to the Emperor; they swore more particularly A.D. 962. to abandon all connexion with Berengar and Purification of the Virgin. his son. The oath was taken on the body of St. Peter.

Yet no sooner had the Emperor returned to Pavia, than the perfidious John, finding that he had unwarily introduced a master instead of an obsequious ally, began to enter into correspondence with Treachery of the Pope. Adalbert, who, driven from every Italian city, had found refuge with the Saracens. Rumors of this treason reached the Emperor. The noble German would not believe the monstrous perfidy; he sent some trustworthy officers to inquire into the truth; they returned with a fearful list of crimes, of license, and cruelty with which the son of Alberic, who seems entirely to have sunk the character of Pope in that of the young warlike, secular prince, was charged by the unanimous voice of Rome. The Emperor calmly replied that the Pope was young, the counsel and example of good A.D. 962. men would soon work a change. In the mean time Otho proceeded to besiege first Queen Willa in the castle San Giulio in the island of the Lago di Garda, then Berengar in his strong fortress of Monte Leone near Montefeltro.

The Pope sent two legates to the camp of Otho to promise amendment, but at the same time boldly re-criminated on the Emperor, as having infringed on his part the solemn treaty. He had seized two of the

Pope's vassals, and compelled them to swear allegiance to himself. Nor had he restored, as he had sworn, the dominions of the Pope. Otho condescended to reply that these men had been seized at Capua, on a mission to Constantinople, hostile to him ; that at the same time others had been taken, who on pretence of a religious mission to the Hungarians,¹ were to incite those unbelievers to attack the dominions of Otho ; that he had not restored all the Roman territory, only because he had not yet recovered it from the enemies of the See. The treason of the Pope, on the other hand, rested not on vague rumor ; the whole correspondence with the Pope's signature and seal was in his hands. Otho sent two bishops, Landobard, a Saxon, and Liutprand of Cremona, to offer the Pope satisfaction as to the charges against his honor : either their own oath, or the wager of battle. His soldier would maintain the fair fame of the Emperor against any champion appointed by the Pope. The Pope, says Liutprand, not without manifest indignation, refused both the oath of the bishops, and the single combat of the warriors. King Adalbert, in the mean time, had emerged from his retreat among July, 963. the Saracens, and appeared publicly in Rome. Otho marched at once upon the capital ; the Pontiff had reckoned on the cordial support of the people ; they recoiled : the Pope and Adalbert fled together from Rome.

The Emperor summoned an ecclesiastical council ; it was attended by the Archbishops of Aquileia (by deputy), of Milan, of Ravenna, and Hamburg ; by two

¹ The Legates to the Hungarians had letters, *plumbo signatas*, to exhort them, *ut super Ottonem Imperatorem irruant*. — Liutprand, *Hist. Otton.* c. 6.

German, and two French metropolitans; by a great number of bishops and presbyters from Lombardy, Tuscany, and all parts of Italy. The whole militia of Rome assembled as a guard to the council round the church of St. Peter. The proceedings of the council mark the times. Inquiry was made why the Pope was not present. A general cry of astonishment broke forth from the clergy and the people — “The very Iberians, Babylonians, and Indians have heard the monstrous crimes of the Pope. He is not a wolf who condescends to sheep’s clothing; his cruelty, his diabolical dealings are open, avowed, disdain concealment.” The calmer justice of the Emperor demanded specific charges. The cardinal presbyter rose and declared that he had seen Pope John celebrate mass without himself communicating. Another, that he had ordained a bishop in a stable; that he had taken bribes for the consecration of bishops, and had ordained a bishop of Todi who was but ten years old. “For his sacrileges, all eyes might behold them;” they alluded, probably, to the dilapidation of the churches, which were open to the weather, and so much out of repair, that the worshippers could not assemble from fear lest the roofs Trial of the Pope, Nov. 6. should fall on their heads. Darker charges followed, mingled with less heinous, in strange confusion; charges of adultery, incest, with the names of the females, one his father’s concubine, another a widow and her niece; he had made the Lateran palace a brothel; he had been guilty of hunting: charges of cruelty, the blinding of one dignified ecclesiastic, the castrating another, both had died under the operation: he had let loose fire and sword, and appeared himself constantly armed with sword, lance, helmet, and breastplate. Both ecclesias-

tics and laymen accused him of drinking wine for the love of the devil ; of invoking, when gambling, heathen deities, the devils Jove and Venus. He had perpetually neglected matins and vespers, and never signed himself with the sign of the cross.

The Emperor could only speak German ; he commanded the Bishop of Cremona to address the assembly in Latin. Liutprand warned the council, he adjured them by the blessed Virgin and by St. Peter, not to bring vague accusations, nor such as could not be supported by accredited testimony, against the holy father. Bishops, deacons, clergy, and people with one voice replied, "If we do not prove these and more crimes against the Pope, may St. Peter, who holds the keys of heaven, close the gates against us ; may we be stricken with anathema, and may the anathema be ratified at the day of judgment !" They appealed to the whole army of Otho, whether they had not seen the Pope in full armor on the other side of the Tiber ; but for the river he had been taken in that attire.

Letters were sent summoning the Pope to answer to these accusations ; accusations some of them so obscene, that they would have been thought immodest if made against stage players.¹ If the Pope dreaded any assault from the enraged multitude, the Emperor answered for the security of his person. The Pope's reply was brief, contemptuous, — "John, the servant of God, to all the bishops. We hear that you design to elect a new Pope : if you do, in the name of Almighty God, I excommunicate you, and forbid you to confer orders, or to celebrate mass !"

Thrice was Pope John cited before the Council.

¹ " Ut si de histrionibus dicerentur vobis verecundiam ingererent "

Messengers were sent to Tivoli; the answer was, "The Pope was gone out to shoot."¹ Unprecedented evils demand unprecedented remedies. The Emperor was urged to expel this new Judas from the seat of the Apostle, and to sanction a new election. John deposed, Dec. 4, 963. Leo, the chief secretary of the Roman See, was unanimously chosen, though a layman, in the room of the apostate John XII.

But the army of Otho, a feudal army, and bound to do service for a limited period, began to diminish; part had been injudiciously dispersed on distant enterprises; the Romans, as usual, soon grew weary of a foreign, a German yoke. The emissaries of Pope John watched the opportunity: a furious insurrection of the people broke out against the Emperor and his Pope. The valor of Otho, who forced the barricades of the bridge over the Tiber, subdued the rebellion. He took a terrible revenge. The supplications of Leo with difficulty arrested the carnage. Otho soon after left A.D. 964.

Rome, and marched towards Camerina and Spoleto in pursuit of King Adalbert. The King Berengar and his wife Willa were taken in the castle of St. Leo, and sent into Germany.

Hardly, however, had Otho left the city, when a new rebellion, organized by the patrician females of Rome, rose on the defenceless Leo, and opened the gates of the city to John. Returns to Rome. Leo with difficulty escaped to the camp of Otho. The remorseless John reëntered the city, resumed his pontifical state, seized and mutilated the leaders of the imperial party, Feb. 964. of one he cut off the right hand, of another the tongue, the nose, and two fingers; in this plight they appeared

¹ "Pharetratus jam in campestrum abierat."

in the imperial camp. An obsequious synod reversed the decrees of that which had deposed John. The Roman people had now embraced the cause of the son of Feb. 27. Alberic with more resolute zeal; for the Emperor was compelled to delay till he could reassemble a force powerful enough to undertake the siege of the city. Ere this, however, his own vices had delivered Rome from her champion or her tyrant, Christendom from her worst pontiff. While he was pursuing his amours in a distant part of the city, Pope John XII. May 14, 964. was struck dead by the hand of God, as the more religious supposed; others by a more natural cause, the poignard of an injured husband.¹

But it was a Roman or Italian, perhaps a republican feeling which had latterly attached the citizens to the son of Alberic, not personal love or respect for his pontifical character. They boldly proceeded at once, without regard to the Emperor, to the election of a new pope, Benedict V.

Otho soon appeared before the walls: he summoned the city, and ordered every Roman who attempted to escape to be mutilated. The republic was forced to surrender. Benedict, the new pope, was brought before the Emperor. The Cardinal Archdeacon, who had adhered to the cause of Leo, demanded by what right he had presumed to usurp the pontifical robes during the lifetime of Leo, the lawful Pope. "If I have sinned," said the humbled prelate, "have mercy upon me." The Emperor is said to have wept. Benedict threw himself before the feet of Otho, drew off the sacred pallium, and delivered up his crozier to Leo. Leo

¹ Other authorities, followed by Muratori, speak of a sickness of eight days.

broke it, and showed it to the people. Benedict was degraded to the order of deacon, and sent into banishment in Germany. He died at Hamburg.

The grateful, or vassal pope, in a council, recognizes the full right of the Emperor Otho and his June 23, 964. successors in the kingdom of Italy, as Hadrian that of Charlemagne, to elect his own successors to the Empire, and to approve the Pope. This right was to belong for ever to the King of the Roman Empire, and to none else.¹

Early in the next year the Emperor Otho recrossed the Alps.² Leo VIII. died, and a deputation March, 965. from Rome followed the Emperor to Germany, to solicit the reinstatement of the exiled Benedict to the Sept. 965. popedom. But Benedict was dead also. The Bishop of Narni (John XIII.), with the approbation or by the command of the Emperor, was elected to the papacy.³

In these dark times the form of a republic seems dimly to arise with magistratures bearing the old and venerable names of consuls, tribunes, and prefects. But whether it was a confederacy of the Roman barons in the city and the neighborhood who usurped these functions, the titles of which had perhaps never been extinct, or a popular movement towards independence, it is difficult to determine. At all events, its avowed aim was to shake off the yoke as well of the Pope as of the Emperor.

¹ See the law in Pertz, *Leg.* ii. 167. The form of the Bull is thought suspicious: of the substance there is no doubt. — Jaffé, *Regesta*, p. 324.

² The Emperor Otho returned from Italy bearing many precious reliques, and splendid marbles to adorn his noble church at Magdeburg. — Thietmar, ii. 10, 11. He was at Pavia Christmas 964.

³ Otho created and disposed of bishoprics with full and unlimited powers. — Thietmar.

Scarcely had John XIII. assumed the pontificate than Dec. 16, 965. the barons and the people began to murmur against the haughtiness of the new pontiff. They expelled him from the city with one consent. The Prefect Rotfred, not without personal insult to the Pope, assumed the government of Rome; for ten months John XIII. was an exile from his see, at first a prisoner, afterwards in freedom. From his retreat in Campania he wrote with urgent entreaty to the Emperor. Otho A.D. 966. made the cause of John his own; for the third time he descended the Alps; the terror of his approach appalled the popular faction. In a counter insurrection in favor of the Pope, Rotfred the prefect was killed, and the gates opened to the pontiff; he was Nov. 12, 966. received with hymns of joy and gratulation.¹ At Christmas Otho entered Rome; and the Emperor and the Pope wreaked a terrible vengeance at that holy season on the rebellious city. The proud Roman titles seemed but worthy of derision to the German Emperor and his vassal Pope. The body of the prefect who had expelled John from the city was dug up out of his grave and torn to pieces. The Consuls escaped with banishment beyond the Alps; but the twelve Tribunes were hanged; the actual prefect set upon an ass, with a wine-bag on his head, led through the streets, scourged, and thrown into prison. All Europe, hardened as it was to acts of inhumanity, shuddered at these atrocities. The Byzantine Emperor Nicephorus Phocas, reproached the ambassador of Otho at Constantinople with his barbarity. Liutprand, though an Italian, was devoted to the Emperor and his cause: he haughtily answered, that his master had only punished, according to the

¹ Continuat. Reginon. sub ann. 696.

imperial laws of Theodosius and Justinian, insurgents against the Empire and the Pope; he had scourged, executed, hanged, and banished these sacri- A.D. 967. legious rebels¹ who had broken their oath of allegiance. If he had not done so, he had been impious, unjust, tyrannical.²

The rebellion was crushed for a time; during the five remaining years of John's pontificate the presence of Otho overawed the refractory Romans. He ruled in peace. At his death the undisturbed vacancy Sept. 6, 972. of the See for three months implies the humble consultation of Otho's wishes (he had now returned to Germany) on the appointment of his successor.

The choice fell on Benedict VI., as usual of Roman birth. The factions of Rome now utterly baffle conjecture as to their motives, as to the pas- Jan. 19, 973. sions, not the principles, which actuated their leaders. Twice (the second time after an interval of ten years, during which he was absent from Rome), the same man, a Cardinal Deacon, seizes and murders two Popes; sets himself up as Supreme Pontiff; but though with power to commit these enormities, he cannot maintain on either occasion his ill-won tiara.

The formidable Otho the Great³ died the year of

¹ "Jugulavit, suspendit, exilio relegavit." — Liutprand. The emperors of Constantinople had never abandoned their pretensions to Rome and Italy. Nicephorus resented the allegiance demanded by Otho of the princes of Benevento and Spoleto, and his hostilities against the few remaining possessions of the Greeks in Southern Italy. He demanded restoration of the Exarchate and of Rome, as the price to be paid for the hand of his daughter. The Romans will appear afterwards, more than once, in their desperation, turning for succor to the decrepit East.

² In the Legatio of Liutprand are some curious details on the Greek clergy. The passage often quoted from Liutprand about the degeneracy of the Romans refers to the *Byzantine* Romans.

³ "Post Carolum magnum regalem cathedram nunquam tantus patriæ rector atque defensor possedit." So writes Thietmar of Otho I.

the accession of Benedict VI.¹ Otho II., whose character was as yet unknown, had succeeded to the imperial throne ; he had been already the colleague of his father in the Empire. He had been crowned at Rome by Pope John XIII.

The year after the accession of Otho II., on a sudden Bonifazio, surnamed Francone, described as the son of Ferruccio, a name doubtless well known to his contemporaries, seized the unsuspecting Pope Benedict and July, 974. cast him into a dungeon, where shortly after he was strangled. Bonifazio assumed the papacy ; but he had miscalculated the strength of his faction, in one month he was forced to fly the city. Yet he fled not with so much haste, but that he carried off all the treasures, even the sacred vessels from the church of A.D. 974. St. Peter. He found his way to Constantinople, where he might seem to have been forgotten in his retreat. The peaceful succession of Benedict VII., the nephew or grandson of the famous Alberic, may lead to the conclusion that the faction of that family still survived, and was opposed to that of Bonifazio. The first act of Benedict, as might be expected, was the assembling a council for the excommunication of the murderer and anti-pope Boniface. This is the first and last important act in the barren annals of Pope Benedict VII. Under the protection of the Emperor Otho II., or by the strength of his Roman faction, he retained peaceful possession of the See for nine years,² an un-

¹ He died May 7, 973.

² Sismondi is probably right that *Domus* or *Domnus*, who is here inserted, was merely a title, *Dominus Benedictus*. This conjecture has the further recommendation of giving the full nine (or ten) years to the papacy of Benedict, according to the epitaph quoted by Baronius. Compare Jaffé, who quotes a work of Giesebrecht as conclusive.

usual period of quiet. He was succeeded, no doubt through the influence of the Emperor, by John XIV., who was no Roman, but Bishop of Pavia. But in the year of John's accession, Otho II. was pre-^{A.D. 983.}paring a great armament to avenge a terrible defeat by the Saracens. He had hardly fled from the conquering Saracens, made his escape from a Greek ship by leaping into the sea and swimming ashore.¹ He now threatened with all the forces of the realm to bridge the Straits of Messina, and reunite Sicily to the Empire of the West. In the midst of his preparations he died at Rome.²

The fugitive Bonifazio Francone had kept up his correspondence with Rome; he might presume on the unpopularity of a pontiff, if not of German birth, imposed by foreign influence, and now deprived of his all-powerful protector. With the same suddenness as before, he reappeared in Rome, seized the Pope, imprisoned him in the Castle of St. Angelo, of which important fortress he had become master, and there put him to death by starvation or by poison.³ He exposed the body to the view of the people, who dared not^{Aug. 20, 984.} murmur. He seated himself, as it seems, unresisted, in the papal chair. The Holy See was speedily delivered from this murderous usurper. He died suddenly, The people revenged themselves for their own base acquiescence in his usurpation by cowardly insults on his dead-body;⁴ it was dragged through the streets, July, 985.

¹ Muratori, *Annali*, ann. 982. Giesebrecht, p. 567.

² Richer, whose valuable chronicle the industry of Pertz has recovered, is very particular on the death of Otho II. He was suffering from indigestion, took four drachms of aloes, which brought on a bloody flux. — b. iii. c. 96.

³ *Chronie. Volturn.* apud Muratori, t. i. p. 11. — R. I. Hermann. *Contract.* sub ann. 984.

⁴ *Catal. Pap.* apud Eccard.

and at length buried, either by the compassion or the attachment, for Boniface must have had a powerful faction in Rome, of certain ecclesiastics. These bloody revolutions could not but destroy all reverence for their ecclesiastical rulers in the people of Rome. The Empire was vacant; Otho III., though he called himself King of Germany and of Italy, had not yet assumed the imperial crown; and Otho was a youth who had but newly succeeded to his father.

The Roman Republic, crushed by the overwhelming power of Otho the Great, now again assumes a distinct form and regular authority; and at the head of this republic is the Consul Crescentius, by the ecclesiastical writers condemned as a sacrilegious usurper, in modern days hailed as the champion and the martyr of Roman liberty. By a probable, if not a certain, genealogy, Crescentius descended from that famous, or infamous, line of Theodora, Marozia, and Alberic, who had so long ruled in Rome.¹ He was the grandson of Theodora

¹ Hoefler, in his *Deutsche Päpste*, a panegyric rather than a history of the German popes, has ingeniously traced this genealogy of the Crescentii from the various epitaphs preserved by Baronius:—

“Corpore hic recubat Crescentius inclytus ecce,
Eximius civis Romanus, Dux quoque magnus.
Ex magnis magna proles generatur et alta
Joanne patre, Theodorâ matre nitescens.”

This was the Crescentius “*caballi marmorei*” of Liutprand, vi. sub ann. 963; the Crescentius of Hermannus Contractus, who imprisoned and strangled Pope Benedict VII., A.D. 964. The *great* parents were Pope John X. and Theodora. This Crescentius had two sons: 1. John, named by Hermann. Contract. sub ann. 689, as having slain the Prefect Rotfred. 2. Crescentius (Numantanus), the Consul. The elder Crescentius became a monk; and by this, and ample and exemplary donations to the Church, atoned for his sins—

“Se Domino tradidit habitum monachorum adeptus,
Quod templum donis amplis ditavit et agris,
Hinc omnis, quicumque legis rogitare memento,
Ut tandem *scelerum* veniam mereatur habere.”

He died July 7, 984.

and the Pope John of Ravenna ; by the mother's side he was nephew of Alberic. Crescentius was Master of the Castle of St. Angelo, so lately possessed by the usurper Boniface (who may have been supported by the Roman party, the house of Alberic), and the Castle of St. Angelo commanded Rome.

John XV., a Roman, had succeeded peaceably on the death of Boniface.¹ But either the Pope disdained to submit to the supremacy of the Consul, or Sept. 985.

the Consul persecuted the Pope. John XV. was either driven from Rome, or retired into Tuscany. His complaints of his contumacious people were heard with favor by the King of Italy, the youthful Otho, whom the Pope tempted to Rome that he might receive the imperial crown. The Romans had too recent and bitter remembrance of the terrible vengeance exacted by the Germans for former revolts. The Pope was A.D. 987.

permitted to return ; he was received with the utmost respect by the Consul and the Senate, whose powers he seems to have recognized without reserve. John XV. ruled for a period of eleven years, in quiet possession of his spiritual, if not of his secular, supremacy. The great imputation on his memory implies an accommodating temper, which would not provoke danger by ill-timed pride. He is charged too with excessive venality.² Possibly the Republic, in its usurpation of the papal power, may likewise have laid claim to some of the revenues of the Roman territory ; the Pope may have been thrown back on his spiritual resources, and

¹ Another John, son of Robert, who ruled for four months, is inserted by some writers ; but this John was called John XV.

² Abbo, the pious Abbot of Fleury, a pilgrim at Rome, describes him as "*turpis lucri cupidum, atque in omnibus actibus suis venalem.*" — Quoted in Muratori, A.D. 996.

so justified to himself his extortions on the appellants to Rome.

But however Rome and the Roman people might depress the Pope, and keep him in subjection to the Consul and the Senate, the Pope had rarely been in these latter times a native but of Rome, at least of Italy. Rome heard with amazement, which it was constrained to suppress, and confusion which it dared not betray, that the Emperor had determined to unite in his own family, his barbarous German family, the Empire and the Papacy. Rome was not only to endure a foreign Emperor, but a foreign Pope. Christendom, in truth, would tolerate no longer the profound ignominy of the Papal See. There was still too much of true religion in the world to submit to such Popes as for nearly a century had profaned the throne of St. Peter. It was no insurrection of disobedience, nor of rebellion at the supremacy of the Roman See; it was an act of loyal reverence, of sincere respect. If Italy could not furnish more worthy pontiffs, Italy must forfeit her exclusive privilege. The determination might appear sudden, but it was the effect of moral indignation which had been long fermenting in the hearts of men, and broke forth when it could no longer be pent up in silence.

The descent of Otho III. to Italy might seem a great ecclesiastical armament of the Transalpine clergy to rescue the papacy from its debasement, the Pope from being the instrument or the victim of the turbulent factions in Rome: to put an end to the notorious vices, the licentiousness, the venality, the intrigues, the ferocious bloodthirstiness, which had so long degraded the head of Christendom.¹ Around the youthful Emperor,

¹ Vita S. Adalberti, apud Pertz.

on whose face the first down of manhood began to appear, were assembled at Ratisbon the great dignitaries of the realm, — Willigis Metropolitan of Mentz, Harburg of Salzburg, the Bishops Hildebald of Worms, Widerold of Strasburg, Rotberd of Spire, Notker of Liège, Haimo of Verdun, Lambert of Constance, Gotschalk of Freisingen, Christian of Passau, Alawick Abbot of Reichenau. Gerbert, the deposed Archbishop of Rheims, afterwards Pope Sylvester, was in the train.¹ Otho confessed himself to the saintly abbot, Romuald of St. Emmeran. And so the Emperor, environed by his hierarchical council, set forth amid the sound of bells and the chants of the clergy, men bearing the holy lance led the way.

Otho celebrated Easter at Pavia, and received the homage of the Lombard princes. He had ar- A.D. 996. rived at Ravenna, where he was met by a message from the clergy, the senate, and the people of Rome, announcing the sudden death, by fever, of John XV., and humbly submitting to the wishes of the Emperor as to the appointment of his successor.

Otho at once proclaimed his determination to place his kinsman and chaplain Bruno, son of the Duke of Carinthia, on the vacant throne. Bruno was a youth of unblemished piety, of austere morals, morals ill suited for the state of Rome, and somewhat fiery temper. The Romans had gone too far to recede. The new Pope appeared in Rome, accompanied by Willigis of Mentz and Hildebald of Worms; he was received and consecrated with seeming joy. The more pious of the monks

¹ These names appear signed to an original document, dated Rome, May 24, 996, published by Höfer, *Zeitschrift für Archivkunde*, i. 538. — Quoted by Gfrörer, p. 1481.

did not disguise their delight. "The news that a scion of the imperial house, a man of holiness, of wisdom, and virtue, is placed upon the chair of St. Peter, is news more precious than gold and precious stones." So writes the holy Abbo of Fleury to his friend.¹

Rome, overawed, had submitted to receive the Pope ;
April, 996. the Pope was followed by the King of Germany, who received the imperial crown from the hands of Gregory V., the name assumed by the new Pope.

May 21. The Emperor held a Council with the ecclesiastics, a Diet with the civil authorities of Rome. The

May 25. Consul Crescentius was summoned to appear before the latter (the Cæsar himself was on the tribunal), to answer for his offences. He was condemned to exile, but pardoned on the intercession of the Pope, who foresaw not how dangerous was his mercy. The Emperor exacted the vain homage of an oath of allegiance from the Romans to himself as Emperor, and an oath of fidelity to the Pope.

Otho withdrew from Rome and from Italy with almost as great rapidity as he had arrived ;² with him departed the German prelates, whose followers perhaps had formed the greater part of the army, content with having achieved their great work, but having taken no measures to secure its permanence.

Gregory was left alone, to overawe as he could by the blamelessness of his life, his gentler virtues, the dignity of his spiritual character, the turbulent patricians and people of Rome, whom Crescentius had already roused and ruled by his eloquent reminiscences

¹ Mabillon. Act. Ord. S. Benedict. vi. 30.

² He was in Rome only till the end of May ; in August at Pavia ; 15th Sept. at Ingelheim. — Böhmer, Regesta, Ottonum, p. 767.

of their former liberties, of their republican glories ; and Crescentius himself, who had already tasted the luxury of power. A year had not elapsed before the Pope was forced to fly from Rome, and reached Pavia in a state of utter destitution.¹ At Pavia he assembled a council of Italian bishops, and launched an excommunication against the rebel Crescentius ; ignorant, in his own profound religious faith, how dead the Romans had become to these familiar terrors. Crescentius laughed to scorn the spiritual menace of an unarmed and unprotected pontiff.

Crescentius wanted an antipope, and an anti-pope soon offered himself : he was not a Roman, but, singular as it may at first appear, a Greek, at least a Calabrian, a subject of the Greek empire. At this juncture the ambassadors of Otho III. at Constantinople returned to Rome ; among these was the Bishop of Placentia. Philagathus was a Calabrian of mean birth ; his knowledge of Greek, still spoken in the parts of Southern Italy subject to the Greek Emperor, had recommended him to the notice of Theophania, the Byzantine wife of Otho II., the mother and guardian of Otho III. He had been employed in important affairs ; had been ambassador more than once to Constantinople, where he had perhaps fostered the ambition, never yet extinct, in the Byzantine Emperor, of resuming his supremacy in Italy. The East, by the marriage of her princess with the Emperor of the West, had again become more mingled up with European affairs ; but that connexion would be no bar to engagements with the Roman insurgents against the authority of the Western Empire.

¹ "Nudus, omnium rerum." — Ann. Hildesheim, 996. Annalista Saxo.

Philagathus had obtained, it was said, by violent means the bishopric of Placentia: he had amassed great wealth by the plunder of that church, and was prepared with his wealth to be the anti-pope of the Roman republic. Crescentius and John XVI. agreed to divide the dominion of Rome; and, under the protection of the Greek empire, the one with the title of patrician or consul to administer the temporal, and the other the spiritual affairs of the city. It cannot be supposed that Crescentius, whatever may have been the views of the subtle Greek Pope, had any serious designs of withdrawing Rome from its position as head of the Western Empire, or of restoring it to its dependence on the despised East.¹ But in his desperation he caught at any alliance, and that alliance with the East was interpreted by the jealousy of the Germans as a deliberate transference of his allegiance. History, in truth, is always seeking for policy, when passions (as is so often the case) are the ruling motives of men. And the ambition of Crescentius was a passion, rather than a calm and heroic aim; it was not content with the temporal power, under the subordinate title of patrician or consul; the asserter of the liberties of Rome (an extant medal confirms the statement of one, though but of one historian) himself assumed the empire.

But the new Emperor or Consul, and the Pope, to whom all agree in ascribing fox-like cunning, had strangely miscalculated their strength. No sooner was

¹ Arnulf of Milan (apud Muratori, *Scrip. Ital.* iv.), said to have made accurate investigations into the history of Rome at that time, writes of John XVI.: "De quo dictum est, quod Romani decus Imperii in Græcos transferre tentasset. Si quidem consultu et ope quorundam civium Romanorum, præcipuè Crescentii ejusdam prædivitis Apostolicam sedem jam violenter invaserat, dejecto eo, qui tunc insederat, venerabili Papâ." — c. ii.

Otho released from the Slavonian war in which he was engaged, than he appeared in Italy¹ at the head of an overwhelming force of Germans and Italians; Italy was prostrate before him. He reached Rome, he entered Rome without the least resistance. Pope John made his escape, but was taken and brought back. The most horrible punishment was inflicted on the traitor to the Empire, the usurper of the Papal See. His eyes were put out, his nose and his tongue cut off, and in this state, it is said by the command of the hard-hearted Pope himself, he was paraded through the streets on an ass with his face to the tail, and the common form of mockery — a wine-bladder, on his head.²

Crescentius shut himself up in the Castle of St. Angelo, and for a short time defied the Emperor. He was at length persuaded to capitulate; but the perfidious Otho ordered him to be beheaded with twelve of his leading partisans; their bodies were hung with their heads downward round the battlements of the castle.³

¹ 997. He was at Pavia, Jan. 5, 998.

² Thietmar, iv. 21. "Gregorius V. . . . apprehendere fecit illum scelestum invasorem, et fecit ei oculos eruere et nasum cum linguâ abscindere et in asello sedere faciens Romam fecit eum circumduci, cum utro in capite." — Chronic. Estens. apud Muratori, S. L. iii. 2, p. 337. Compare Cat. Pontif. Eccard iv. Acta S. Nili. That holy hermit is there said to have interceded for the life of his wretched compatriot. The Emperor consented; but the savage Pope was not yet satisfied. ὁ δὲ ἄγριος Πάπας ἐκείνος, μὴ χορτάσθεις ἐφ' οἷς ἔπραξεν εἰς τὸν προρρηθέντα Φιλάγαθον, tore his dress from him, and then ordered him to be paraded through the city, as in the text. Out of this Höfler has made a religious romance about the Pope's indignation at John's wearing the dress of a priest, not of a penitent (as if the poor blinded and mutilated prisoner could choose his dress). With more flagrant dishonesty, he attributes the cruelty of the Pope to the Roman people. Nilus, a Greek it is true, predicted the wrath of God both against Pope and Emperor. On the same authority (Acta S. Nili) rests the pilgrimage of Otho to Mount Garganus to expiate his cruelty towards John XVI.

³ Rudolphus Glaber has an incredible story of Crescentius appearing before the Emperor, and being allowed to reënter the castle.

So, says the historian, turbulent Rome was awed to peace before the Emperor.¹

But if Rome could not defend, it could revenge itself. Feb. 999. The German Pope enjoyed his recovered dignity hardly a year, and that not without disturbance; he was cut off in the flower of his age, as it was commonly believed by poison. Crescentius, too, was fearfully avenged; how avenged the close of three or four years will show, neither to the honor of the Emperor, nor of Rome.²

¹ "Sic Roma ante mobilis regis quievit in oculis." — Arnulf.

² "Sed post discessum ejus (Ottonis III.) a Romanis expulsus, ac deinde veneno peremptus est." — Vit. S. Meinweri, c. 10. Compare Acta S. Nili. Gfrörer, with his marvellous felicity for discerning recondite villanies, attributes Gregory V.'s death to his successor!! whom he calls the "serpent of Ravenna — die Schlange zu Ravenna!" — p. 1507.

CHAPTER XIII.

OTHO III. POPE SILVESTER II.

GREGORY V. had died, but the youthful Emperor Otho lived, revolving magnificent schemes of empire, and little foreseeing the fate which awaited him so speedily in Rome, the object and the centre of his ambitious designs. The first Millennial period of Christianity was drawing to its close. In many parts of Christendom there prevailed a deep and settled apprehension that with the thousandth year of Christ the world would come to an end. That last day, when Christ would return to judge the world ; the day which, since the times of the Apostles, the more profoundly religious, especially in periods of more than usual darkness and calamity, had beheld as immediately at hand, as actually bursting upon the world, could not delay beyond this fatal period. The vague but awful language of prophecy had dwelt in strong terms on the period of a thousand years, as if divinely appointed to enclose certain phases of human history ; and many of the most dreadful predicted signs (never wanting to those who seek for them with the sagacity of terror), the wars and rumors of wars, above all the want of faith upon the earth, might seem to justify these cowering apprehensions of the timid — the triumphant anticipations of the more ardent and hopeful believers. At

the beginning of the century, the end of the world had been announced by a grave council.¹ The end of the world is at hand, was publicly preached at Paris.² Men hastened to propitiate the coming, almost present Judge, by the sacrifice of their ill-gotten, now useless possessions. The deeds of the time, the donations of estates, and of all other gifts to the Church, are inscribed with the significant phrase, the end of the world being at hand.³

But while these fears were lurking in the hearts of pious but obscure men ; while they were darkening the dreams of holy recluses, and dictating the wills of penitent sinners trembling on the brink of the grave ; the great men of Europe, the secular and ecclesiastical potentates entertained no timid misgivings as to the duration of the world. In Italy, in Rome the centre of Italy, these terrors were unknown. The Emperor himself, instead of apprehending the close, looked to the opening of the new Millennium but as the dawn of a Western Empire, as vast and comprehensive, more firmly established, and more stably organized, than that of Charlemagne. Otho had imagined the reëstablish-

¹ See Gieseler, *Lehrbuch*, 2, 1, p. 267. Michelet, *Hist. des Français*, lib. iv. c. 1, sub init. "Dum jam jamque adventus imminet illius in majestate terribili ubi omnes cum gregibus suis venient pastores in conspectum pastoris æterni." — *Concil. Trosleian.* sub ann. 909.

² Abbo, the Abbot of Fleury, had heard this sermon in 990. — Galland, xiv. 141. "Æstimabatur enim ordo temporum et elementorum præterita ab initio moderans secula in chaos decidisse perpetuum, atque humani generis interitum." — Radolf. Glaber, l. iv. 39.

³ "Appropinquante mundi termino."

But compare Dr. Todd's *Donnellan Lectures*, who curiously traces the expectation of the final judgment through every century. Dr. Todd denies that the clergy encouraged the donations of land — "appropinquante mundi termino" — more about the year 1000 than at other times. It is a question hardly capable of proof.

ment of the Roman Empire, with Rome for its capital.¹ In all the hopefulness of youth, in the pride of an imperial descent for three generations, he resolved on the vast but impossible scheme of restoring Rome to her ancient authority as the seat of empire.² The reformation of the clergy by the renovated power of the Pope, the correction of that notorious avarice and venality for which Rome was already infamous,³ was to be accomplished by the appointment of a Supreme Pontiff truly apostolic in his character. The two great powers, the spiritual and the temporal, each working in his separate sphere, were to dwell together in the same eternal metropolis, and give laws, wise and holy and salutary laws, to Christendom.⁴ Rome might seem to have cast a spell upon the mind of the Teuton; it was on the Aventine Hill that he conceived and brooded over this great vision. He dismissed his German followers; he returned hastily, having appointed the new Pope, to Germany: in Germany it was observed, not without jealousy, that he was environed by Italians.

¹ "Imperator antiquam Romanorum consuetudinem jam ex parte magnâ deletam suis cupiens renovare temporibus, multa faciebat, quæ diversi diversè sentiebant." — Thietmar, iv. 29.

² "Româ solum quam præ ceteris diligebat ac semper excolebat, exceptâ." — 30.

³ "Tota Italia Roma mihi visa est; Romanorum mores mundus perhorrescit." — So had written Gerbert, Epist. 40, apud Duchesne, ii. 728. Gerbert was to know more of Rome. Thietmar writes of Rome: "Corruptis autem pecuniâ cunctis primatibus maximèque Romanis quibus cuncta sunt venalia." — iii. 5.

⁴ "Eodem tempore imperator Romam profectus in antiquo palatio, quod est in Monte Aventino, versabatur, et sicut juvenis tam viribus audax quam gerere potens, magnum quiddam ibid et impossibile cogitans, virtutem Romani Imperii ad potentiam veterum Regum ad tollere conabatur. Mores etiam ecclesiasticos quos avaritia Romanorum pravis commercationum usibus vitiabat, ad normam prioris gratiæ reformare aestimabat." — Chron. Camerac. c. 114, apud Bouquet, x. 296. Compare Giesebrecht, p. 680 *et seqq.*

Yet as if too his mind was not exempt from that holy
A.D. 1000. awe which prevailed in other parts of Europe, the conduct of Otho during his short residence in Germany had a serious and melancholy character. He made a pilgrimage to Gniesen, to the grave of Adalbert, the Apostle of Bohemia, the friend of his youth ; he entered the town as a penitent, with discrowned head, and naked feet. At Quedlinburg he celebrated Easter with his sister, the holy abbess Adelheid. At Aix-la-Chapelle, in obedience to a dream, he commanded the grave of the great Teutonic Emperor of the West, Charlemagne, to be opened. The body was found seated on a golden throne in royal apparel, with a crown of gold and jewels, and the sceptre in his hand. Otho took a cross of gold from his neck, and some part of his raiment, and commanded the tomb to be again closed over his imperial predecessor. This singular ceremony, this investiture, as it were, by the dead Charlemagne, at all events, this association of the two great names, coincided with the visionary ambition of Otho, and with the specific object of that ambition.

Nor was the successor of Gregory V. a man to despair of the future fortunes of the world, to acquiesce in dreaming and indolent prostration of mind in the approaching termination of human affairs. Gerbert had gradually risen by his great abilities ; his sagacity in ruling the minds of men ; his learning, which awed his age ; his unimpeachable morals, and his character for profound piety, through all the successive steps of ecclesiastical advancement to the second see in the West.

Gerbert was born near Avrillac in Auvergne, of obscure parentage. He was received into the

school of the Clugniac Abbey at Avrillac. The abbot Gerald admired the indefatigable thirst for knowledge and the fervent piety of the youth, who felt himself born for great purposes. It happened that Borel, the Count of Barcelona, visited the monastery; he took the youthful student with him into Spain. There the zeal of Gerbert did not prevent him from profiting by the mathematical science and advanced knowledge then exclusively possessed in Europe by the Mohammedan schools.¹ He is said to have visited Cordova, where the Omniade Caliph, Hakim II., held his splendid court, and patronized the peaceful arts and sciences. But the learned and scientific studies of Gerbert, so far beyond his age, were not those of a recluse and contemplative monk; nor did his Arabian skill in arithmetic, geometry, and astrology perhaps rather than astronomy, fall under the suspicion with which they were looked upon in later legend, as forbidden and magic arts. Gerbert must be archbishop and Pope, and incur all the hatred inevitable during contentious times in such high functions, before he is branded as a necromancer. With Count Borel, and with Hatto, Bishop of Vich, in Catalonia, Gerbert visited Rome.² There he attracted the notice of the Pope (John XII.) and of the Emperor Otho I. By Otho he was recommended to Adalbero, Archbishop of Rheims. He taught in the school of that city, the ecclesiastical metropolis of the Franco-Gallic church. He accompanied the Archbishop Adalbero again to Italy in the expedition of Otho II. That Emperor bestowed on him the famous Abbey of Bobbio.

¹ His Geometry is said to indicate Arabian sources of knowledge.

² It was during this expedition that he had his curious disputation (the first scientific scholastic disputation) with Otric the Saxon. See the remarkable details in Richer.

But if the Italian manners of Rome shocked the piety of Gerbert, the turbulent and intriguing monks of Bobbio gave him no peace. Their poverty and nakedness distressed the Abbot. Former abbots had wasted, had even alienated the estates of that once splendid foundation of St. Columban.¹ The neighboring nobles who had obtained possession of the lands of the abbey demanded the ratification of their usurped rights.² Gerbert was persecuted; accused before the Emperor and the Empress Adelheid. He fled to Rome, with nothing left but his pastoral staff, and his apostolic ordination. But the Pope, trembling for his own life, could give him no protection; and the death of his patron Otho II. left him utterly defenceless. He abandoned Italy, lest there he should be obliged to join the enemies of Otho.³ He returned to Rheims to live under the patronage of Archbishop Adalbero. For ten years⁴ he taught in the school of Rheims the whole range of human science;⁵ at the same time he acted as secretary

¹ "Cum videam monachos meos attenuari fame; premi nuditate . . . nescio quibus codicibus, quos libellos vocant, totum Sanctuarium Domini venundatum est. Collecta pecunia nunquam reperitur; apothecæ et horrea exhausta sunt: sed in marsupiis nihil est." — Gerbert, Epist. ad Othon. Imper. Compare Epist. iii. to the Bishop of Tortona. Epists. iv., v., and xii. *et seqq.*

² Epist. xx.

³ See the five first of Gerbert's epistles, apud Bouquet.

⁴ This probably includes his former residence and teaching.

⁵ Richer is diffuse on the whole course of Gerbert's lectures. They comprehended rhetoric, logic, music, geometry, astronomy. He explained the poets Virgil, Statius, Terence; the satirists Persius, Juvenal, Horace; the *historian* Lucan. Richer describes the "sphere" of Gerbert, and the Abacus, seemingly as wonders, yet unknown north of the Pyrenees. M. Haureau (*Hist. de la Philosophie Scholastique*) seems to think rather more highly of Gerbert's treatise *De Rationali et Ratione Uti* (published by Pez, *Thes. Anecd.* v. 1) than the authors of the *Hist. Littéraire*, and M. Cousin, p. 154.

to the Archbishop; in the Archbishop's name and in his own maintained a constant correspondence with Adelheid, the widow of the elder; with the Greek Theophania, the widow of the second and mother of the third Otho.¹

The great but almost silent revolution was now taking place which raised the house of Capet to the throne of the effete race of Charlemagne. Rise of Hugh Capet. Hugh Capet received the crown of France from the hands of the Archbishop of Rheims.² His son June, 987. Robert was consecrated by the same holy prelate. Christmas, 987. On the death of Archbishop Adalbero, Hugh's accession, Jan. 23, 988. a few months after, the metropolitan throne of Rheims might seem, like that of the Roman pontiffs, to have become the mark of secular as well as of spiritual ambition. But the contest for this hierarchical dignity, with no less violence and treachery, had something of feudal character. Adalbero, according to Gerbert, had bequeathed to him the care, the primate had hoped the succession to the See.³ But it was too valuable a prize to be surrendered at once to a low born man, however the most distinguished in Christendom for learning and science. Arnulf, a bastard son of the royal house of France, the falling Carlovingian house, aspired to the dignity. The bastardy was a Arnulf of Rheims. blot in the ecclesiastical escutcheon, but might be washed off by the mystical sacramental power of the

¹ Curious notices of books, especially of science, as well as historical facts, are scattered throughout Gerbert's letters; but they sadly want a critical editor.

² On the election of Hugh Capet, read the speech of Archbishop Adalbero, repudiating the notion of hereditary *right* to the crown. — Richer.

³ "Taceo de me, cui nullæ (mille) mortes intendebantur: et quod pater noster Adalbero me successorem sibi designaverat, cum totius cleri, et omnium episcoporum, ac *quorundam* militum favore." — Epist. cl. ii.

Church.¹ Hugh Capet, from some unknown policy, supported the pretensions of Arnulf: he appeared at Rheims, and though he affected to leave the free election to the clergy and people, disguised not his own inclinations. Arnulf's oath of fidelity to Hugh Capet, couched in terms of more than usual severity of imprecation, has been preserved by a contemporary writer.² Arnulf took the sacrament on this oath, and observed it — a few months. Arnulf was seized with compassion for his own despoiled and injured house. Hugh Capet became a usurper. The gates of Rheims were opened to Charles of Lorraine, the head of the Carlovingian party. The archbishop at first pretended total ignorance of his own act; he was at length compelled to throw off the mask. Gerbert, also, had discovered the wrongs of the Carlovingian house.³ He is become, as though indispensable in that office, the secretary of Arnulf, as he had been of Adalbero. In a letter to Bishop Adalberon or Ascelin, of Laon, he addresses him as his dear friend, and acknowledges how deeply he is mingled up with plots, conspiracies, litigations, secular affairs. "Why should this wrong be inflicted

¹ "Sed tamen hæc mater ecclesia purificans mysticis abluit sacramentis." See the proclamation of Arnulf, written by Gerbert, Epist. ii. 1. Hugh Capet does not seem to consider the bastardy a blot: he commends Arnulf to the citizens of Rheims as "divæ memoriæ Lotharii ex concubinâ filius." — Richer, Lib. iv.

² "Quod ei imprecatur pro felicibus contumeliosa, pro salutaribus pernicioiosa, pro honestis turpia, pro diuturnitate punctum, pro honore contemptum; et, ut totum concludatur, pro omnibus bonis omnia mala." — Richer. This valuable work of Richer was first discovered and published by Pertz. It has been reëdited and translated by the Historical Society of Paris.

³ "Patruo igitur miserescebat; illum cogitabat; illum colebat; illum pro parentibus carissimum habebat, apud quem collato consilio quærebat quonam modo in culmen honoris provehere possit, sic tamen ut ipse regis desertor non appareret."

on the elder house? why is it dispossessed of the throne?"¹

King Hugh Capet sent ambassadors to Rome to demand the deposition of the perfidious and rebellious Arnulf. Heribert, Prince of Vermandois, with Charles of Lorraine, the chief of the Carlovingian faction, appeared in person on the other side. Heribert brought more cogent arguments; it was not only a beautiful white palfrey which he presented to the Pope, but more solid gifts in other quarters, to Crescentius, Lord of Rome. The ambassadors of King Hugh stood unhonored and unheard at the doors of the Vatican. Gerbert was in dire perplexity. With unconscious effrontery he confides his own double dealing to his friend the Archbishop of Treves. He ^{Difficulties of Gerbert.} had pledged himself to King Hugh; he trembled at the power of Charles of Lorraine, still, with Arnulf, master of Rheims. But on the side of Hugh Capet were the offers of the education of his son Robert, and the archiepiscopate.² He sent his letter of repudiation to Arnulf, yet with strange simplicity he entreated Arnulf to take under his special care certain houses which he

¹ "O felix quondam et dulcis amice sub imperio patris mei Adalberonis! . . . Ille ego qui sub imperio beatæ memoriæ patris mei Adalberonis militaveram in scholâ omnium virtutum. Nunc regiam incolo aulam, cum sacerdotibus Dei vitæ verba conferar (conferam?). Nec ob amorem Karoli aut Arnulfi diutius passus sum fieri organum diaboli . . . pro mendacio."

² "Pervenit, beatissime Pater, gladius usque ad animam. Hinc fide promissi Regibus Francorum urgemur, hinc potestate Principis Karoli, regnum ad se revocantis adducti, permutare dominos aut exules fieri cogimur." — Epist. xiv. In another letter; "Dicimus tacenda, tacemus dicenda; agimur quod volumus, quod volumus nequimus." — Epist. xi. He consoles himself that he never actually *swore* allegiance but to the Emperor Otho: "Nulli mortalium unquam aliquando juris jurandum præbui nisi D. M. Othoni."

had built in Rheims.¹ He had now discovered that Arnulf had been raised by simoniacal, and therefore heretical means. Arnulf's apostasy from his lord the king reveals all his diabolical wickedness. Gerbert becomes aware that Arnulf was a plunderer, a spoiler, not an administrator of the See. Gerbert's perceptions A.D. 989. may have been quickened by the synod of French bishops at Senlis, which declared the monk priest Adalgar, who had opened the gates of Rheims to Charles of Lorraine, under the ban of the Church and the Bishops of Rheims and Laon out of communion.

The betrayal of Arnulf by Adalberon of Laon into the hands of King Hugh Capet is a scene of treachery and impiety unparalleled even in those days. Adalberon, as Gerbert's letter shows, had been but now on the Carolingian side. He was the prelate accused of adulterous intercourse with Emma, wife of King Lothair; now his widow, it was asserted by some, through poison administered by her episcopal paramour.² Charles of Lorraine and Arnulf the Archbishop were committed to several prisons.

King Hugh Capet waited not his tardy, it might be Council of Rheims. unsuccessful, appeal to Rome. A council was July 17, 991. instantly summoned in the monastery of St. Basolus at Rheims. The Archbishops of Sens and Bourges, eleven bishops, a great number of abbots took their seats; they sate as feudal nobles, as well as

¹ "Libellus repudii." — Epist. xxiv.

² It is just to observe that Richer relates the death of Lothair as natural. See also the pathetic letter of Queen Emma to the Empress Adelheid: "My hope was in my son (Louis le Fainéant, now dethroned by Hugh Caput); he is become my enemy. . . . They have invented infamous charges against the Bishop of Laon." — Richer, iv. 61.

prelates of the Church, to adjudge the crime of treason, as well as to depose the Metropolitan. The long formal procedure for the degradation of Arnulf contrasts with the easy and rapid transference of the kingly power from the Carlovingian to the Capetian dynasty. To depose an Archbishop of Rheims was an affair of difficulty and intricacy, compared with the dethronement of a king of France.¹

Arnulf beheld confronted before him Adelgar the priest who had opened the gates of Rheims to Charles of Lorraine. Adelgar swore that the keys had been confided to him for the express purpose of the treason by the Archbishop. "Whoso believes me not on my word, I am ready to satisfy by the ordeal of fire, by boiling water, or red-hot iron." Bishop Guido of Soissons bore witness against the Metropolitan. A more revolting, a nameless charge was brought against the falling prelate by Rayner, his private secretary. Arnulf shuddered: he was permitted to retire with the Archbishop of Sens and three bishops. These prelates returned to the council, declaring that Arnulf, smitten in the conscience by God, had fallen at their feet, confessed his sins, and acknowledged that he ought rightfully to be deposed from the dignity which he had unworthily assumed. The other prelates were not content without being witnesses of his humiliation. Nor were they satisfied with this; they brought him before the people; they forced him to stammer out his consent to his own degradation. Nor was this all: they

¹ The acts of the Council of Rheims were drawn up by Gerbert. Baronius pours forth a torrent of indignation against him, whom even the papal dignity does not exculpate from the sin of having presumed to deny or to limit the pontifical power in this Council.

would preclude the reversal of their sentence by bold anticipative defiance of the interposition of Rome. Arnulf, Bishop of Orleans, in the name of the king, delivered doubtless in the words of Gerbert, a long elaborate harangue, which amounted to the renunciation of all allegiance to the pope ; the declaration of independence, if not of superiority to the Italian pontiff. It spoke, as Gerbert might justly speak in all the pride of preëminent science and learning, of the profound ignorance of Rome. “There is not one at Rome, it is notorious, who knows enough of letters to qualify him for a door-keeper ; with what face shall he presume to teach, who has never learned ?” It spoke of the gross venality of Rome. “If King Hugh’s ambassadors could have bribed the pope and Crescentius, his affairs had taken a different turn.” It recounted the revolting crimes which for the last many years had sullied the papacy ; the crimes of John XII. (Octavian), who had cut off the nose and the tongue of John the Cardinal ; of Boniface, who had caused John XIII. to be strangled, and starved John XIV. to death in the dungeons of the Castle of St. Angelo. “To such monsters, full of all infamy, void of all knowledge, human and divine, are all the priests of God to submit ; men distinguished throughout the world for their learning and holy lives ? The Roman pontiff who so sins against his brother, who often admonished refuses to hear the voice of counsel, is as a publican and sinner. Though he be seated on a lofty throne, glittering with purple and gold ; if he be thus without charity, thus puffed up by vain knowledge, is he not Anti-Christ ? He is an image, an idol, whom to consult is to consult a stone.”¹ Towards the close ;

¹ Concil. Remens. sub ann. 991.

the Bishop of Orleans speaks with a kind of lofty compassion, and vouchsafes as it were a few words of reserved respect for Rome. "Worthy, or unworthy, we will respect her edicts, if the welfare of the realm be not thereby endangered." Significant words follow: "She has already lost the allegiance of the East; Alexandria, Antioch, Africa, and Asia are separate from her; Constantinople has broken loose from her. The interior of Spain (here we recognize Gerbert) knows nothing of the Pope." The orator not obscurely applies those titles, under which the Pope was long after designated by his foes; he is not only Anti-Christ, but also "the Man of Sin, the Mystery of Iniquity." Had visions crossed the bold mind of Gerbert of a kind of Transalpine papacy at Rheims? If so, disappointment came upon him with his greatness. For the council, not content with the degradation of Arnulf, placed Gerbert on the vacant cathedral throne.

The form of Gerbert's election is remarkable. It is by the bishops, who complain that on a former occasion they were compelled by popular ^{Gerbert}Archbishop. clamor, popular clamor that once cried, "Crucify him, crucify him!" to make an unworthy choice. It was no boy whom they now deliberately chose, but a man of mature age, known to them from his youth; of profound learning and piety. Gerbert's confession of faith is still more extraordinary. On the Trinity, and other points of doctrine, it is elaborately orthodox. He adds: "I prohibit not marriage; I condemn not second marriages. I do not blame the eating of flesh. I acknowledge that reconciled penitents should be admitted to communion. All sins original, as well as voluntary, are washed away by baptism. I believe no

one can be saved out of the Catholic church. I confirm the four great councils.”¹

Gerbert had been advanced, unwillingly, if his own words are to be credited, to the archiepiscopal see. But his election was unpopular; the people were indignant at the bishops assuming the election; the severity of his morals offended the looser clergy; the want of birth was an inextinguishable delinquency with the high-born prelates. He was accused as having betrayed, imprisoned his master, and violated his spouse, that is, usurped his church.² Adalberon, the perfidious Bishop of Laon, envied the advancement of Gerbert; to dethrone his rival he entered into negotiations with the German Court of Otho, from which Gerbert, by throwing himself into the interest of Hugh Capet, had undesignedly estranged himself. Theophania, the Greek Empress mother, was now dead; Adelheid, his grandmother, or the boy Emperor, Otho III., demanded a legate from Pope John XV. to reverse the iniquitous sentence pronounced against Arnulf, and the promotion of Gerbert. It was time for the Papal See, even at its lowest state of degradation, to assert its trembling authority, to assert that authority at the summons, and therefore under the protection of the imperial house of Saxony. Leo, the abbot of St. Boniface in Rome, appeared as the papal legate to adjudge this

Fall of
Gerbert.
A.D. 995.

A.D. 991.

¹ Gfrörer, with his customary too great ingenuity, makes out of this convenient adulation to the family of Hugh Capet a design to throw off the Pope, and assert the absolute independence of the Gallican Church. The clergy were to be won by the permission of marriage. It reads to me more like a renunciation of Manicheism, which Gerbert may have thought necessary or expedient. — Gfrörer, p. 1462.

² “Ut major fiat invidia, obloquitur, Dominum tuum tradidisti, carceri mancipasti, sponsam ejus rapuisti, sedem pervasisti.”

great cause, conjointly with the Bishops of France and Germany.

On the first menace of the papal interference, the French prelates, who met at a place called Chela, seemed resolute in the assertion of their liberties. But the papal legate was a man of courage and ability equal to the occasion. The Roman abbot Leo promulgated an answer to the harangue of the Bishop of Orleans at Rheims.¹ This remarkable document (but lately come to light) strikes in its outset at Gerbert as the author of the speech of the Bishop of Orleans at Rheims. "The acts of your synod, which have been delivered to me, fill me with abhorrence. Truly is the word of the Lord fulfilled in you, 'There shall be many anti-Christ's;' so know we that the last day is at hand. Christ, who cannot lie, has said that the blessed Peter is the foundation of your ^{Abbot Leo Legate.} churches, yet say your anti-Christ's that in Rome there is now but a temple of idols, an image of stone. Because the vicars of Peter and their disciples will not have for their teachers a Plato, a Virgil, a Terence, and the rest of the herd of Philosophers, who soar aloft like the birds of the air, or dive into the depths like the fishes of the sea; ye say that they are not worthy to be doorkeepers, because they know not how to make verses. Peter is indeed a doorkeeper — but of heaven." Thus abbot Leo repels the charge of ignorance; to that of gross venality his answer is certainly not that of Italian address. "Did not the Saviour receive gifts of the wise men?" He does not deny the crimes charged

¹ It has been published by Pertz. *Monumenta Germaniæ*, iii. 686. — Hoeck's *Life of Gerbert* was written before the publication of this, and of Richer.

against Popes, but urges the warning example of Ham, accursed for uncovering his father's nakedness. He asserts that the prerogative of the See of Rome is from God himself; it cannot be annulled, or transferred to any other see. To the asseveration of the revolt of Asia, Africa, and Spain from the Roman See, he avers that it is utterly false, and declares that ambassadors from Alexandria, Jerusalem, Carthage, Cordova, have but lately paid homage, and consulted the See of Rome.

Whether through the presence or the arguments of the papal legates, or the countenance of the Court of A.D. 995. Otho, or the interests or the apprehensions of Hugh Capet of France (he died the next year), Gerbert stood alone at Moisson before a synod of but a few German prelates,¹ Ludolf of Treves, Notkar of Liege, Siegfried of Munster, Haimo of Verdun. The A.D. 996. papal legate sate in the centre. The Bishop of Verdun, as understanding it might seem alone among these Teutonic bishops, the Gaulish (the Roman tongue), opened the session. Gerbert made an eloquent speech, but to an adverse court. The legate pronounced the sentence of interdict from communion, and from the exercise of his episcopal functions. Gerbert boldly overwhelmed them with citations from the canons, that such interdict against a man convicted of no crime was illegal. The council adjourned the final decree.

Gerbert contemplated further resistance. The future Pope, in a letter to the Archbishop of Sens utters these un-Roman doctrines, — “Rome cannot make lawful that which God condemns, nor condemn that which God has made lawful. Rome cannot expel from her

¹ Concilium Moisson., compared with the last chapters of Richer.

communion him who is convicted of no crime. The papal decrees are only of force when they concur with the Evangelists, the Apostles, the Prophets, and the genuine canons of the Church.”¹

But deserted by all, shunned as under interdict,² he thought it wisest at length to bow before the storm. He retired from France to the court of the Emperor Otho. There, however, degraded from his archiepiscopate, it might seem through the imperial interest, Gerbert ceased not to be the most distinguished ecclesiastic for knowledge and erudition north of the Alps, perhaps in Christendom. He resumed all his old honor and respect; the court of Otho was proud of his presence; the spell of his powerful mind was cast on the young and ambitious Otho. One step towards the height of power had been made, and he had fallen back; he was ere long to make the other two.³

We return from this long but necessary episode, the life of Gerbert, to the magnificent schemes of Otho III. for the restoration of the empire in its transcendent Cæsarean power to Rome; of the popedom in its boundless, but strictly spiritual dignity.

Gerbert was now again free to follow with undivided devotion the fortunes of the Imperial House. France had cast him off: he was the vassal of Otho. He joined the great assemblage of prel-

Gerbert,
Archbishop
of Ravenna.
A.D. 998.

¹ Epistol. Arch. Senonen.

² Compare his letter to the Empress Adelheid: “Memini enim meos conspirasse non solum milites, sed et clericos, ut nemo mecum comederet, nemo sacris interesset.” — Epist. c. 411. A third rival candidate for the archiepiscopate was in the field, Gebuin.

³ Read the skilful letter to the Emperor Otho: “Scio me divinitatem in multis offendisse et offendere. . . . Tribus ut ita dicam sæculi ætatibus vobis, patri, avo, inter hostes et tela fidem purissimam exhibui.” — Epist. xxx. The famous lines are ascribed to Gerbert himself. Scandit ad R. (Rheims) Gerbertus, ad R. (Ravenna) Post, Papa viget R. (Rome).

ates, and accompanied his imperial master to Italy. There the Archbishop of Ravenna having retired to monastic seclusion, Gerbert, though a Transalpine, was raised at once to the second see of Italy.¹ On the death of Gregory V. Otho could find no prelate so likely to enter into, or to carry out (if Gerbert's influence had not first suggested, and constantly kept alive) his magnificent visions, as the man who stood alone as

Gerbert the most eminent prelate of his age, in learn-
Pope. ing peerless, in piety unimpeachable, Gerbert
April, 999. of Ravenna. Gerbert took the significant name of
Silvester II., the new Silvester of the new Constan-
tine.

The decree for the election of Gerbert issued by the Emperor develops the designs of Otho and of his Pope. In the name of the Holy Trinity, Otho the servant of the Apostles, by the will of God the Saviour, Emperor of the Romans: "We declare Rome to be the capital of the world, the Roman Church the mother of the churches; but the dignity of the Roman Church has been obscured by her neglectful and ignorant pontiffs; they have alienated the property of the Church without the city to the dregs of mankind² (these were the feudatory princes of the Roman States), made every thing venal, and so despoiled the very altars of the apostles. These prelates have thrown all law into confusion; they have endeavored to retrieve their own dilapidations by

¹ Gregory V. grants the pall to Gerbert, as Archbishop of Ravenna, April 28, 998.

² See the comminatorium of Gerbert to the neighboring barons, whom he accuses of slaying priests, robbing the Church and the poor. — Epist. ii. xli. Gerbert had the high satisfaction of magnanimously condescending, as Pope, to reinvest his old rival Arnulf in his full archiepiscopal rights and honors. — Epist. ii. lv. Dec. 999.

the spoliation of us; they have abandoned their own rights to usurp those of the empire." He denounces the donations of Constantine and Charlemagne as prodigal and unwise; he assumes the power not merely of electing, but by God's grace of creating and ordaining the Pope. Finally, he grants eight counties to the Pope — Pesaro, Fano, Senigaglia, Ancona, Fossambruno, Osimo, Cagli, and Iesi.¹

But ungrateful Rome seemed loth to enter into the lofty schemes of the Emperor for her aggrandizement; the presence and the power of the ^{Rome} revolts. Emperor did not overawe her conflicting factions. The feudatory nobles of the neighborhood might well resent the denunciations and suspect the power of their new lord. Tibur broke out in rebellion; the lord of that city was the kinsman of Crescentius and the ancestor of that line of counts who in the next century created and unmade popes. Tibur was compelled to yield to the overpowering force of Otho: but on his return to Rome Otho found the gates closed. He ascended a tower near the walls, addressed the people in the prophetic language of expostulation, reminded them of his attachment, of his plans for their aggrandizement. They yielded probably rather to the terror of his arms than to the force of his eloquence. The gates were opened, and again they swore allegiance to their irresistible sovereign. But at this very moment the dire tragedy was hastening to its close. No Nemesis more awful ever darkened the stage of Greece. *Stephania.* Stephania, the wife of Crescentius, had, on his fall,

¹ The decree names only seven: Pisaurum, Fanum, Senigalliam, Anconam, Fossimbrunum, Gallihesem, Ausimum. Is the last but one, made out of Cagli and Iesi?

been abandoned to the brutal lust of the German soldiers.¹ With stern self-command she suppressed her indignation, her loathing, within her heart. At the end of three years she had nursed up her fatal beauty to its old exquisite lustre. Otho himself, the religious Otho, was caught in her toils, which she spread with consummate art. She scrupled not to ascend the bed of her husband's murderer. With Stephania vengeance was cheaply bought at such a price. She feigned the passionate love of a mistress, till the opportunity came of administering a subtle poison.² In Italy such poisons were too well known, and here there seems convincing evidence to the truth of this crime, throughout Italian history always suspected, always credited, yet rarely with stronger proof than suspicion. The hand of death was upon the bright, hopeful youth. He withdrew from Rome, either expelled by a new insurrection secretly guided by Gregory of Tusculum, or with his constitution shattered by the poison administered through the hand of Stephania: he withdrew, not to collect his faithful troops and crush the rebellious city, but as a penitent, to deplore and expiate his sins. His countenance was still cheerful to his faithful adherents; but his time was spent in tears, in prayer, in almsgiving. Already had he made a pilgrimage in the

¹ "Stephania autem uxor ejus traditur adulteranda Teutonicis." — Arnulf, c. 12. Höfler kills her of this ill-usage.

² "Incidit in insidias mulieris malæ, cujus virum Crescentium jusserat capitalem subire sententiam, quam formæ elegantissimæ nimis insipienter thoro suo socians, ab eâ veneno intra cubiculum dormians, infectus est." — Vit. S. Meinweri apud Leibnitz, i. p. 521. Compare Ann. Saxo. Leo Ostiens., Landulf senior, Radulph. Glaber. The modern German writers, zealous for the honor of Otho, seem inclined to doubt this story. Muratori accepts it. It seems to me to rest on as good authority as most events of the time.

preceding year to atone for his perfidious execution of the Consul Crescentius, and his cruelty to Pope John XIV. Heaven, it is to be hoped, was more merciful than the wife of Crescentius. Deeply must Otho, cut off at the age of twenty-two years, have rued his fatal connection with Rome, which neither terror could control, nor the hopes of her restoration to glory propitiate to a Transalpine sovereign. The world, especially the Transalpine world, deplored the untimely fate of this promising prince, who seemed destined for nobler ends. Rome might seem to crown her wickedness by this last unequalled crime.¹

¹ Höfler has published a curious popular poem on the death of Otho and the election of Henry II. The following are stanzas:

“ Quis dabit aquam capiti ?
 Quis succurret pauperi ?
 Quis dabit fontes oculis ?
 Lacrymosis populis
 Sufficientes lacrymæ (as)
 Mala mundi plangere ?
 Ad triumphum ecclesiæ
 Cœpit Otto crescere :
 Sumsit Otto imperium
 Ut floreret sæculum :
 Vivo Ottone tertio
 Salus fuit populo.
 * * * * *
 Plangat ignitus Oriens,
 Crudus ploret Occidens :
 Sit Aquilo in cinere,
 Planctus in Meridie.
 Sit mundus in tristitiâ,
 Nostra luge cithara.
 Plangat mundus, plangat Roma,
 Lugeat Ecclesia.
 Sit nullum Romæ canticum,
 Ululet palatium.
 Sub Cæsaris absentia
 Sunt turbata sæcula.”

Beitrag, xvi. p. 331.

On the other hand Bonizo, the Bishop of Sutri, expressing no doubt a

The faithful Pope Silvester had followed the Emperor in his retreat from Rome; he returned to Rome after his death. But Gerbert had seen three generations of Saxon Emperors expire in sad succession: the next year he followed them to the tomb.¹ Popular rumor attributed, if not his death, yet a grievous malady, to the same remorseless Stephanian. He is said to have lost his voice by poison, which she contrived to have administered to him.² Such were the crimes believed in those days to be perpetrated, if not actually perpetrated, on holy popes and on Emperors. All the magic art which fame attributed to Gerbert furnished no antidote. But Pope Silvester, throughout the following ages, was remembered with a kind of awful misgiving, with shuddering horror, lest the throne of St. Peter should have been occupied by a necromancer, by one whose wonderful powers could only have been attained through a compact with the Evil One.³

strong Italian feeling of the time, condemns Otho to hell, for his cruelty to Pope John of Ravenna: "*Domino odibilis sine viatico vitam finivit . . . Quo mortuo et in infernum sepulto.*" — *Liber ad Amic. iv.*

¹ Otho died Jan. 22, 1002; Silvester, May 12, 1003.

² "*Veneficio ejusdem mulieris etiam Papa Romanus gravatus asseritur; ita ut loquendi usum amisierit.*" — *Ann. Saxo.*

³ William of Malmesbury is full on the magical arts and enchantments of Gerbert. He stole his book of glamour; his miserable death is the indubitable proof that the accusations of magic and doing homage to the devil are true (pp. 275, 284). Such was the belief in remote Britain. A more brief funeral oration cannot be imagined than that in the *Vit. Pontif. Ravennat*: "*Homagium diabolo fecit et male finivit.*" — p. 207.

But compare *Hist. Lit. de la France* and Vincent of Beauvais in the *Encyclopædia of the Middle Ages*. Gerbert in Spain, the land of necromancers, fell in love with the daughter of one of those accursed doctors: he stole his books. The magician, by the aid of the stars, pursued the robber. But Gerbert too had learned to read the stars. By their counsel he lay hid under a bridge, through the arches of which rushed the roaring waters. The devil descended, and bore him away on his wings beyond the sea; with the design of establishing at a future time,

by an awful delusion, one of his own abhorred supporters on the chair of the chief apostle.

Modern readers will be more struck with wonder at Gerbert's organ, which went by *steam*: "Ipse Gerbertus fecit arte mechanicâ horologium et organa hydraulica, ubi mirum in modum, per aquæ calefactæ violentiam, implet ventus emergens concavitatem barbati (barbiti?) et per multos foratiles tractus aeræ fistulæ modulatos clamores emittunt." — Vincent Bellov. Spec. Hist. xxiv. c. 98.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE TUSCULAN POPES.

THE first attempt to rescue the papacy from the hands of the turbulent patricians or fierce populace of Rome, to open to the whole Western Church the appointment to the supreme headship of Western Christendom, had ended in failure. Nearly another half century must elapse before Transalpine Christendom, by asserting her right of supplanting a line of degenerate Italian pontiffs by men more worthy of the high office, shall compel Italy, in her turn, to bring forth and to train men who, through their commanding abilities, win back the lost tiara, and revenge Italy for her temporary obscurity by reducing beneath her feet the rebellious Teutonic Church and even the Western Empire.

Three undistinguished popes, John XVII., who lived less than six months after his election, John XVIII., and Sergius IV., ruled for ten years of obscurity.¹ The contest for the kingdom between Ardoïn, Marquis of Ivrea, whom the Italians had chosen on the death of Otho, and the Emperor Henry II., was decided in the north of Italy. All the great prelates of the north espoused the impe-

Popes
John XVII.
John XVIII.
Sergius IV.

¹ John XVII., June 13, Dec. 7, 1003; John XVIII., Dec. 25, 1003, June, 1009; Sergius, July, 1009, died 1012, June 16.

rial interest¹—Tibald, Marquis and Archbishop of Ravenna, the Bishops of Modena, Verona, and Vercelli openly maintained, the Archbishop of Milan, the Bishops of Cremona, Piacenza, Pavia, Brescia, and Como hardly disguised their inclinations to, the same cause. The Pope alone seems to have stood aloof in unregarded insignificance. Rome, abandoned to herself, had resumed her republican constitution. The family of Crescentius had risen again to power. John, the son of the beheaded consul,² whether through the prevailing interest of Stephania, or by the solicitude of Otho to win popularity in Rome, had been created prefect of the city under the Emperor. On Otho's death he assumed the title of Patrician, and ruled the city and the Popes with arbitrary power.³

But adverse as it may be safely conjectured, and rival to the lineal descendant of Crescentius, had risen the Counts of Tusculum. These ^{Counts of Tusculum.} counts were also descended from Marozia and Alberic, and closely connected, being a younger branch of the same family, with the house of Crescentius. The Counts of Tusculum had resisted Otho III. in the zenith of his power. A strong faction in Rome were jealous of the Tusculans, and reproached Otho for his blind clemency in not razing to the ground that dangerous and rebellious fortress, which was in too close neighborhood to Rome. Possibly a temporary junction between these two great rival houses led to the perilous state of things, which induced the dying Otho to leave the impracticable, if not insurgent city. The Counts of

¹ Adelbert in Vit. S. Henrici.

² See the genealogy in Höfler.

³ "Destructor Apostolicæ sedis." — Thietmar, A.D. 1012.

Tusculum seemed to have attached themselves to the new Imperial House which succeeded to that of Saxony. They governed Rome by less violent means than the Crescentii, whose power they gradually supplanted; they bought the venal people, and appointed Popes by the most open simony. The Papacy became an appanage of their family; they had almost succeeded, had they not blindly abused their influence, in rendering it hereditary. Three Popes in succession from this powerful family became the heads of Christendom.

The first of these, Benedict VIII., did not ascend the throne without opposition. Gregory, an antipope, was set up by the adverse party, possibly by the patrician Crescentius. Benedict fled for protection and support into Germany to the Emperor Henry II., who had now made great progress in the reduction of Ardoïn, his rival for the kingdom of Italy. The price of protection was the usual one — the gift of the imperial crown in Rome. But some peaceful revolution, brought about possibly by the terror of the Emperor, or the reconciliation of the Counts of Tusculum with John the Patrician (the Crescentius), permitted Benedict to return to Rome and resume his full pontifical rights.¹ When Henry II. appeared in Rome, Benedict received him, according to ancient usage, on the steps of St. Peter's. The Patrician John showed all outward signs of homage to the Transalpine, laid splendid presents at his feet, and made more splendid promises; yet in secret he endeavored, but in vain, to impede the coronation of the

Benedict
VIII.

Emperor
Henry II.

¹ The time of Benedict's return is unknown to Muratori. In 1012 he is granting privileges to German prelates. He was at a synod with the Emperor at Ravenna, Jan. 1014. His return must then have been in 1012.

Emperor.¹ Nevertheless the coronation took place.² Henry displayed and exercised all the rights of sovereignty, coined money with his own superscription, and administered justice in his own name. Benedict ruled in peace. John Crescentius still held the office of Prefect of the city; Alberic, the brother of July, 1014. the Pope, was Consul and Senator.³ Yet even from a Crescentius, described as son of Count Benedict, the Pope wrested estates, which, when Consul, the Crescentius had seized, belonging to the famous monastery of Farfa. The spoiler was summoned before the Pope's tribunal; for Benedict wanted neither ability nor courage, at least that of a secular prince. By his activity and personal prowess a powerful armament of Saracens, which had landed in the territory of Pisa at Luna, was attacked and cut off almost to a man. The king only escaped; the queen was taken; her head-dress of gold and jewels, worth 1000 pounds, was sent as a present by the Pope to the Emperor Henry. The indignant Saracen, it is said, sent a large bag of chest- A.D. 1016. nuts to the Pope, with a billet, "I will return with as many valiant Saracens to the conquest of Italy." The undaunted Pope sent him back a bag of millet. "As many brave warriors as there are grains will appear at my bidding to defend their native land."⁴ The Pope

¹ "Apostolicæ sedis destructor, muneribus suis et promissionibus phaleratis regem palam honoravit, sed Imperatoriæ dignitatis fastigium eum ascendere multum timuit, omnimodisque id prohibere clam tentavit."—Thietmar, 1014.

² The coronation the 24th or 14th of Feb. Muratori, sub ann. 14 Feb. Jaffé.

³ Compare a Placitum published by Mabillon, Ann. Benedict. sub ann. 1016.

⁴ Thietmar, vii. 31. Muratori conjectures the king to have been Mugello, who had possession of Sardinia. His summons to the troops was "ut ini-

more than maintained his lofty language: his legate was sent to Pisa and to Genoa, urging those cities, now rising into mercantile importance and power, not to endure the possession of an Italian island by the unbeliever. The united forces of these two cities expelled the Saracens from Sardinia, but they quarrelled about the spoil. The Pisan annalist claims the investiture of the island by the Pope for his city, which retained the sovereignty.¹ Benedict maintained his amicable relations with the Emperor Henry II.

Defeat of
Saracens by
the Pope.

A.D. 1020. The Pope visited the Emperor at Bamberg; during the next year the Emperor descended into Italy. The Pope and the Emperor had a common enemy, the Greeks of Apulia and the south of Italy. The Greeks, seconded by the Prince of Capua and some of the southern chieftains, had taken the aggressive; in possession of Capua they would have threatened Rome herself. At this time Rodolf, a Norman, with some few followers, half adventurers driven from their native lands, half pilgrims to the shrine of the apostles, appeared at Rome. The martial Pope enlisted them in his cause, and garrisoned with them the strong fortress on the Garigliano; the forces of the Emperor overran Apulia. His general, Poppone, Archbishop of Aquileia, besieged and took Capua; the prince was at the mercy of Henry, who hardly respected a safe-conduct given by the Archbishop of Cologne. Troja, after an obstinate siege, surrendered. Henry was prepared to wreak his revenge on the city: he was melted to tears by a saintly hermit coming forth from the gates

micos Christi secum circumferant." The Pope claimed the queen's head-dress, the "*spolia opima, aurum capitale, ejusdem (reginæ) ornamentum* Papa sibi præ ceteris vindicavit."

¹ *Annali Pisani*, p. 107.

with the children of the city in procession, chanting Kyrie Eleison! The Emperor and the Pope visited together the monastery of Monte Casino. The Emperor was relieved from excruciating pains, which he was suffering, by the intercession of St. Benedict: he rewarded the saint by ample donations to the monastery.¹

On the death of Benedict VIII., the Tusculan house by the same quiet but unresisted influence, undisguised bribery, elevated the brother of Benedict, a Jan. 28, 1022. layman and prefect of the city, to the papal throne.² The Emperor Henry II. died in the course of the same year. For nine uneventful years the power John XIX. Aug. 1, 1022, to April 7, 1029. which had created, maintained John XIX. in peaceable possession of the papal throne. Between three and four years elapsed before Henry III., the son and successor of Henry II., could journey to Conrad the Salic. Rome to receive the Imperial crown. His coronation was the important affair of the Pontificate of John. It was attended (so great was still the reverence for Rome in the remoter parts of Europe) by two pilgrim kings, present to behold the eternal city, and to do homage to the chair, to the religion, to the March 26, 1027. successor of St. Peter. These were Rudolf III. of Burgundy, and Canute the Danish King of

¹ Radulf. Glaber. The *religious* Pope, with the *religious* Emperor, at a synod at Pavia, passed decrees strictly prohibiting the growing usage of the marriage of the clergy; no clerk might have wife or concubine; no bishop have a female in his dwelling; the sons and daughters of clerks were slaves of the Church; anathema on him who adjudges them to be free. — Pertz, Leges, ii. 561.

² “Uno eodemque die et laicus et pontifex fuit.” — Romualdæ. Salern. Chron. S. Muratori, H. It. vii. “Qui uno eodemque die prefectus fuit et Papa.” This clause had been erased, but was restored in the MS. of Bonizo.

England. The ceremony did not pass off without a tumult. A fierce fray took place between the barbarous and undisciplined Germans and the turbulent Romans ; it ended in a great slaughter of the Romans. The leaders were compelled to appear before the haughty Emperor in the garb of penitents, with naked feet ; the free men with their swords unsheathed, the slaves with osier cords round their necks, as if deserving to be hanged.¹ Another tumult more characteristic broke out between two Eriberts, archbishops of Ravenna and Milan. Each claimed the privilege of standing at the right hand of the Emperor. The decision, as might be expected, was against the Prelate of Ravenna, the old traditionary antagonist of the Pope. Eribert of Ravenna boldly took the place ; the Prelate of Milan wished to avoid an open rupture ; the Emperor, by the advice of the Pope, withdrew his hand from that of the Archbishop, and summoned the Bishop of Vercelli to his right hand. But Eribert of Ravenna still persisted in his right : the followers of the two archbishops came to blows, and the Ravennese was obliged to fly. A council asserted the right of the Archbishop of Milan, but Ravenna defied the decree both of Pope and council.

The hereditary papacy in the House of Tusculum, Jan. 1033. if it had debased the Holy See by men of rapacity and violence, had yet maintained the peace of Rome for twenty years, and their Popes as secular princes had not been wanting in energy and vigor. Now as though their object had been to reduce it to the lowest contempt, or as if, although the older and more able branches of the family disdained or would not sub-

¹ Wippo, Vit. Conrad Salici.

mit even to the outward restraints of the office, nevertheless they would not allow the dignity to depart from their house ; by their irresistible gold they secured the Pontificate for a boy not more than ten or twelve years old, the nephew of his predecessors, Benedict and John.¹

Benedict IX. had all the vices of a youth born to uncontrolled power ; the Papacy had to endure the evils without the counteracting advantages of hereditary monarchy. In Italy, more especially in Rome, this transmission of the grace of the priesthood, or the spiritual power of the Supreme Pontificate through the worst and most licentious of mankind, seemed to jar on no strong religious sensitiveness, to rouse no general remonstrance of indignation. No vice could interrupt the descent of power imparted, according to its own proper theory, for the extirpation of vice : so entirely had that which was outward and formal prevailed over the inward and moral conception of Christianity. Beyond the Alps, at least in the remoter parts of Western Christendom, the individual Pope was merged in his office. The revolutions in Rome disturbed not the ideal sanctity with which the religious imagination arrayed the successor of St. Peter. In some cases the writers in Germany, though ecclesiastics, seem to have been ignorant of the name of the ruling Pope. For twelve years Benedict IX., under the protection of his powerful kindred, ruled in Rome, in the words of one of his successors, Victor III., leading a life so shameful, so foul, and execrable, that he

¹ "Puer ferme decennis, intercedente thesaurorum pecuniâ, electus extitit a Romanis." — Radolfus Glaber, iv. c. 5.

shuddered to describe it.¹ He ruled like a captain of banditti, rather than a prelate. Adulteries, homicides perpetrated by his own hand, passed unnoticed, unrevenged; for the patrician of the city, Gregory, was the brother of the Pope: another brother, Peter, an active partisan. Once, according to one doubtful authority, he had been already expelled, but replaced by the Emperor Conrad the Salic.² The oppressed people at length grew weary of his robberies, murders, and abominations. They rose and drove him from the city, and

A.D. 1044.
April 10.

proceeded to the election of John Bishop of Sabina, who took the name of Silvester III. But they had sold themselves to the Tusculan tyranny, and were not permitted to shake it off; the Consuls were partisans, doubtless kindred of the Pope; Benedict returned in triumph; the anti-Pope retired in disgrace and excommunicated to his bishopric. Benedict himself grew weary of his office, or despaired of maintaining it, or perhaps put it up to auction with no intent of fulfilling the contract. According to another by no means inconceivable story,³ he was deeply enamoured of his cousin, the daughter of Gerard de Saxo (of the rock), master perhaps of some strong hill fortress. The father refused his daughter, unless the Pope would surrender the papacy. He actually sold the papacy to an arch-Presbyter, named John,⁴ of

Sale of the
Papacy.
Gregory VI.

¹ "Benedictus ille nomine, non factis, cujusdam Alberici filius (Magi potius Simonis, quam Simonis Petri vestigia sectatus) non parvâ a Patre in populum profligatâ pecuniâ, summum sibi sacerdotium vindicavit. Cujus quidem post adeptum sacerdotium vita quam turpis, quam fœda, quam execranda extiterit, horresco referre." — Victor III., Dialog. lib. iii. apud Mabillon, Act. S. S. Benedict. sec. iv.

² Radolfus Glaber, sub ann. 1038.

³ Bonizo, ad Ann.

⁴ "Joanni Archipresbytero non parvâ ab eo acceptâ pecuniâ, summum

the same house, who assumed the name of Gregory VI. John, the arch-Presbyter, was a man of learning for his day, of unimpeachable chastity, now become in Rome so rare as to be called an angelic virtue. By his own admission he had heaped up enormous wealth, which he intended to dedicate to pious uses. Among these pious uses (according to this Didius Julianus of the Papacy) was his own advancement. Not only did he pay a large sum to Benedict himself, he confessed the purchase of the suffrages of the people; it was a pious use to restore the right of election to its lawful owners. Such acts ascribed to Gregory VI. throw some light on these times of darkness and confusion. It is natural to inquire into the sources of this enormous wealth by which the Counts of Tusculum had so long retained the Roman people in their pay. It is probable that the papacy was enslaved by its own wealth: that this powerful house had obtained by forcible or fraudulent alienation large parts of the estates of the Church. Gregory had bought the papacy; but it was not a barren and impoverished see which he coveted.¹ He devoted himself immediately to the recovery of the ecclesiastical possessions at the point of the sword; and to the suppression of another great source of revenue to the turbulent barons of Rome and the neighborhood, the plunder of the pilgrims to Rome. These pilgrims, who still flocked on with unwearied zeal to the Holy City,

sacerdotium tradidit." — Victor III., Dialog. lib. iii. "Ejusdem pontificatus per cartulam refutavit Johanni suo patrino."

¹ It is strange enough to find Peter Damiani (he was but young) rejoicing in the accession of Gregory VI. as the future extirpator of simony. "Latantur cœli . . . conteratur jam mille forme caput serpentis: cepit commercium perversæ negotiationis: nullam jam monetam falsarius Simon in ecclesia fabricet Dei." — Epist. i. 1. Compare Epist. ii.

arrived, instead of opulent and munificent votaries at the sacred shrines, miserable and plundered beggars. So entirely was Pope Gregory occupied in these achievements, that the Roman people gave him a colleague to officiate, when he was engaged in war within the Church.¹

There were now three Popes, by themselves or by Three Popes. their factions engaged in deadly feud. They had laid aside, or had taught each other to despise, their spiritual arms; they encountered with the carnal weapons of ordinary warfare. For Benedict had not obtained his bride; Gerard de Saxo had joined the faction of Silvester III. Benedict's brother would not brook the obscurity of the house of Tusculum: they brought back, not unreluctant, the abdicated Pope and reinstated him on his throne. Benedict held the Lateran, Gregory Santa Maria Maggiore, Silvester St. Peter's and the Vatican.

Christendom could not longer be ignorant of, or endure this state of things. Peter the Archdeacon of Rome, commissioned by the vows and prayers of a great number of the clergy, the monks, and more devout people, crossed the Alps, and threw himself at the feet of the Emperor, imploring his succor. The Emperor Henry III. was called upon by his title to the Empire, by his own grave and religious character, by

¹ According to William of Malmesbury, on Roman affairs no high authority, these sanguinary occupations of the Pope disqualified him in the eyes of the Romans for his holy office. The Romans would have been the last to take offence at such exploits in a Pope. But a strong anti-Tusculan party may have felt so much interest in the recovery of the estates of the Church from those lawless barons, and in the security of the roads, by which the pilgrims might reach Rome with their wealth, that they may have acquiesced in the Pope's discharge of his sacred functions by a deputy. — William of Malmes. lib. ii.

the open or the tacit summons of the pious throughout Europe, and even of those who respected the Church : he was implored, in popular verse, to dissolve this odious Trigamy of the Church,¹ and to interpose his irresistible authority. He crossed the Alps, and was received either with loud acclamations or with silent awe. At Piacenza, Gregory, supposing his own claims to the papacy irrefragable, ventured to meet him.² Henry gave no answer, but advanced to Sutri, about thirty miles north of Rome. There he assembled a Council of many prelates : among them were the Patriarch of Aquileia, the Bishop of Augsburg, and the Archbishop of Arles. In this Council he proceeded to examine the claims of the conflicting Popes. Silvester was condemned at once as an usurper, and delivered up, degraded from his holy orders, to be imprisoned for life in a monastery. The voluntary abdication of Benedict annulled his claim.³ Gregory fondly thought that there was now no obstacle to his universal recognition. But he was called upon to give an account of his own election. He could not deny, he could not attempt to extenuate, the flagrant simony of those proceedings by which he had bought the papacy. He admitted his guilt, his disqualification, stripped off the pontifical robes, and intreating forgiveness, quietly surrendered up the papacy.⁴ He retired, not without compulsion, into a

A.D. 1046.
Dec. 20.

Degradation
of Benedict
IX. and
Gregory VI.

¹ "Una Sunamitis nupsit tribus maritis,
Rex Henrice, Omnipotentis vice,
Solve connubium triforme dubium."

² Some writers, summed up by Luden (*Geschichte der Deutschen*, vol. viii. p. 191), suppose a secret understanding between the Emperor and Pope Gregory.

³ "Maximè cum ipse, Romanus Pontifex, se judicaverit deponendum."

⁴ "Ego Gregorius Episcopus, servus servorum Dei, propter turpissimam

monastery in Germany ; his involuntary companion in his exile was no less than the famous Hildebrand.¹

venalitatem simoniacæ heræseos, quæ antiqui hostis versutiâ meæ electioni irrepsit, a Romano episcopatu judico me submovendum." — Bonizo. Victor in Dialog. lib. iii.

¹ Muratori, sub ann. 1046.

BOOK VI.—CONTEMPORARY CHRONOLOGY.

POPE.	EMPERORS OF THE EAST.	PATRIARCHS OF CONSTANTINOPLE.	GERMAN EMPERORS.	KINGS OF FRANCE.
A.D. 1046 Clement II.	A.D. 1047	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
1048 Damasus II.				
1048 Leo IX.	1054	Constantine Monachus 1054		
1054 Victor II.	1057	1054 Theodora II. 1056	Henry III. 1056	
1057 Stephen IX.	1058	1056 Michael VI. 1057	1056 Henry IV.	
1058 Benedict X.	1059	1057 Isaac Comnenus 1059		
1059 Nicolas II.	1061	1059 Constantine Ducas 1068		Henry I. 1061
1061 Alexander II. 1073		1068 Romanus Diogenes 1071		1061 Philip I.
1073 Gregory VI.		1071 Michael VII.		

BOOK VI.



CHAPTER I.

THE GERMAN POPES.

THE evil of the degraded papacy lay deeper : it was absolutely necessary to rescue it entirely and forever from the Counts of Tusculum and the Barons of Rome. The only remedy was the appointment of a stranger. Murmurs were heard that no one could canonically be elected Pope who had not been ordained Deacon and Priest in the Church of Rome. The insulting language of the Germans was, that in the whole Church there was scarcely one who was not disqualified either as illiterate, or as tainted with simony, or as living in notorious concubinage.¹

Suidger, the Bishop of Bamberg, was consecrated Clement II. Pope at Sutri ; the first Pope consecrated out of Rome.² On the arrival of the Emperor at Rome, the usual appeal was made to the Roman people whether they knew one worthier to be Pope. The German sol-

¹ "Neminem ad Romanum debere ascendere pontificatum, qui non in eâdem ecclesiâ presbyter et diaconus."— Bonizo, apud Gefalium. "Ut in tantâ ecclesiâ vix unus reperiri potuit, quin vel illiteratus, vel simoniacus, vel esset concubinator." Bonizo is a bad historian for the past, but an unexceptionable evidence of the violence of the Italian feelings against a German pope. Compare Leo Ostiens. and Victor III.

² So at least says Bonizo. Compare Herman. Contract. A.D. 1096.

diers stood around ; the people preserved an obsequious silence. The Bishop of Bamberg was led by Henry himself to the Papal throne : the people seemed to assent by their acclamations.¹ Suidger took the name of Clement II., the first, it might be hoped, of a new line of apostolic pontiffs, called after the immediate successor of St. Peter. Henry and his Empress Agnes received the imperial crown from the hands of the new Pope. The coronation was celebrated with unusual pomp and solemnity. The Pope exacted from the religious Emperor, not merely the most full confession of faith, and the oath of fidelity and of protection to the Roman see, but of chastity, justice, humility, and charity. The Pope enforced on the Emperor, the Emperor with the most profound submission pledged himself in the face of heaven to observe these Christian virtues.²

The first act of reformation which the religious part of Christendom expected from the promotion of this blameless and holy stranger to the Roman see, was the summoning a Council at Rome to brand the all-prevailing vice of the times. Simony was condemned in the strongest general terms and in all its various forms ; but even this Council was obliged to mitigate its censure. The severer bishops proposed the absolute degradation of any one of their order who had been guilty of this sacrilegious sin ; they were reduced to the melancholy confession, that the Church would be nearly

¹ If Benzo of Albi is to be believed, Henry told them to elect any one present. The Romans replied that in the presence of the Emperor the election was not according to their will: "Ubi adest presentia regis, non est electionis consensus in arbitrio nostræ voluntatis."— Benzo, apud Menckenum, i. 393.

² Cenni Monumenta, ii. 261, contains the ordo for the coronation of Henry and Agnes. Höfler devotes many pages to the ceremony, i. 236–250.

deprived of all its pastors, since the ordination by a simoniacal bishop annulled the orders.¹ Whoever was knowingly ordained by a simoniacal bishop, was bound not to exercise his functions till after forty days' penance. But Clement sate alone in his unworldly holiness; the Council, assembled to reform the Church, was interrupted, if not broken up, by a fierce dispute for precedence between the Archbishops of Ravenna, of Milan, and of Aquileia. The decision in favor of the German Archbishop of Ravenna, unpopular doubtless with the Italians, was confirmed by threats of excommunication against the other contumacious prelates, if they should renew the strife.² Rome herself might seem impatient of foreign rulers. The fatal climate asserted her injured supremacy. Clement II. died before the close of the year.³

A.D. 1047.
Oct. 9.

A bold attempt was made to reassert the claims of Benedict IX. Benedict IX. He appeared in Rome under the protection of the Marquis of Tuscany, and held the pontificate for nine months. But he fled

¹ So universal was this crime, that the Abbot Guido, when Boniface of Tuscany, the father of Matilda, one of the most pious churchmen of the day, went to make his annual confession at the monastery of Pomposa, thought it right to scourge this vice out of the penitent: —

“ Sic de re Guido sacer abbas arguit, immo
Hunc Bonifacium, ne venderet amplius, ipsum
Ante Dei Matris altare flagellat amaris
Verberibus nudum, qui deliciis fuit usus,
Pomposæ vovit tunc abbatique Guidoni,
Ecclesiam nullam quod per se venderet unquam.”

Donizo, i. 14.

² Labb. Concil. sub ann.

³ I quote once for all the famous lines of Peter Damiani, applicable on so many German invasions of Rome: —

“ Roma vorax hominum, domat ardua colla virorum,
Roma ferax febrium, necis est uberrima frugum,
Romanæ febres stabili sunt jure fideles.”

again on the first appearance of the new Pope environed by German soldiers ; he had been abandoned by the Tuscan marquis.¹ For the obsequious clergy and people had in the mean time sent to Germany to submit themselves to the nomination of the ^{July 16,} 1048.

Emperor.² Halinard, Archbishop of Lyons, declined the perilous advancement ; the choice fell on Poppo, Bishop of Brixen. He had hardly time to ^{Damasus II.} reach Rome, and to take the name of Dam- ^{Aug. 9, 1048.} asus II., when he too fell a victim to the summer fever. This pontificate lasted but twenty-three days.³

This rapid succession could not but give rise to reports of foul means, employed by the unscrupulous Italians to get rid of these strangers, no less dreaded for their austerity, than hated for their usurpation of the Roman rights. But Italy was overawed by the commanding character and unshaken authority of the Emperor Henry III. No secular power dared to offer resistance, there was no Cisalpine prelate, whose lofty piety and courageous sacerdotal dignity could venture, or warrant opposition. Rome and Italy again looked submissively to the Transalpine monarch for a successor to these two short-lived Pontiffs.

Yet this absolute nomination to the papacy by the

¹ Vit. apud Murat. Annal. Roman. p. 469.

² It is said that Benedict IX., persuaded by the Abbot of Grotta Ferrata, retired into that monastery, repented of his sins, and died an exemplary monk. But S. Peter Damiani, on the authority of the Bishop of Capri, raises his ghost, to compel his successor to devote some of his ill-gotten wealth to the poor. — Opuscul. xiv. 3.

³ Boniface, Marquis of Tuscany, received orders from the Emperor to conduct this bishop "full of pride" to Rome, where in twenty days he died, body and soul. — Bonizo, p. 803. Was this merely the Italian hatred to a German pope, or some personal hostility of Bonizo? Either way it is characteristic.

uncontrolled authority of the Emperor could not but alarm the jealous hierarchical spirit throughout Europe, as well as in Italy. The flagrant venality and vices of the Roman clergy might justify, for once or for a time, the intervention of the supreme secular power. The declared aversion of Henry to the dominant evil of simony, the lofty language which he used concerning the reformation of the Church, his own profoundly religious life, might tempt the most zealous churchmen to acquiesce in a despotism commended by such results, and exercised so much for the honor and for the welfare of Christendom. But the clergy, ever as intuitively and sagaciously jealous to detect the secret encroachment of any principle dangerous to their power, as skilful in establishing any one favorable to their interest, were not off their guard. There was one, whose searching eyesight was watching, who was warning, and taking measures to awaken that dread of secular interference, which came even countenanced by such manifest and uncontested advantages. Hildebrand, in his exile in Germany, was steadily surveying the course of affairs.

The imperial choice fell upon a prelate, in whom, *Leo IX.* though of noble descent, and nearly allied to the Emperor,¹ the churchman predominated over the subject of the Empire. Though with such claims to the highest advancement, supported as it now too rarely was, with the fame of transcendent piety avouched by vision, wonder, and spiritual communion with the other world, Bruno had contented himself with the poor and humble bishopric of Toul.² There he was distinguished

¹ The Emperor Conrad's mother and the father of Bruno were cousins german. Conrad spoke of his "*consanguineum et . . . affectum avitæ propinquitatis.*" — Wibert, *Vit. Leon. IX.* i. 18.

² The early life of Bruno is related by his affectionate and admiring fol-

by his unimpeachable holiness, his gentleness to those below him (he constantly washed the feet of the poor), but no less by his inflexible assertion of all the rights and possessions of his see and the privileges of his order. According to his affectionate biographer, his person was beautiful, his charity boundless, and he had a rare power of affecting his hearers as a preacher, even hardly less as officiating in the services of the church. He was accomplished in all the science of the time, especially in music. Nor did he altogether decline, or betray any want of capacity for secular affairs; he had interposed as ambassador in the disputes between the Empire and the kingdom of France; his negotiations had maintained the peace between Conrad and King Robert.

The Bishop of Toul might tremble at the awful responsibilities of the papacy.¹ As a pilgrim he had visited year after year the tombs of the Apostles; he knew Rome, he knew how uncongenial was her air to the German constitution, her manners to the austere virtue of a severe German prelate. Some natural dread, some misgivings as to the possibility of a complete reform may have mingled with the Christian humility which shrunk from the glorious burden. Even after his reluctant consent, he absolutely refused to owe his election to the mere will of the Emperor; he would at the least have the outward show of free consent from the clergy and people of Rome. This strong hierarchical feeling was confirmed, it is said, by the refusal of Hildebrand, whose austere virtue and lofty churchmanship had be-

lower, Archdeacon Wibert, with its full portion of legendary marvel. — Apud Muratori, *Script. Ital.* iii.

¹ There is a recent, prolix, and somewhat feeble biography of Leo IX., by a zealous Roman Catholic, Hünkler (Maintz, 1851). It contains, I think, nothing new.

gun to command notice, to accompany to Rome a Pope, chosen by the uncanonical appointment of a layman. In the strong language of Hildebrand, it was to appear as an apostate, not as an apostle.¹ Had it been suggested by no loftier motive, nothing could have been more politic than this flattery to the pride of the Roman clergy and people. Whether he did not assume, or throw off by the advice of Hildebrand, the mitre and the purple robe, the Bishop of Toul did not travel to Rome as a pontiff but as a pilgrim. His humble attire and demeanor attracted far more notice than the familiar pomp of a prelate. Multitudes crowded around him; it was rumored that celestial music was heard, and that wonders attended upon his journey. The Teverone suddenly withdrew its overflowing waters to let him pass. He was met, as he drew near, barefooted, to Rome, by the clergy and the people; but even then he would not ascend the papal throne without a solemn appeal to the semblance at least of an election, a recognition of his authority by what appeared to be free suffrages.²

Nothing could contrast more strongly than the whole demeanor of Leo IX., such was the name he assumed, with the Italian popes, who had recently held the holy office. His first object was the restoration of the dilapidated church of St. Peter, and visits to the celebrated places of pilgrimage, Mount Garganus, and the monastery of St. Benedict at Monte Casino. He had unexampled difficulties to struggle with. The wealthy See

¹ Bonizo, apud Œfel. ii. p. 83. Compare a long note of Theiner, *Die Einführung der erzwungenen Ehelosigkeit*, v. ii. p. 6.

² One account, intended for panegyric, would convict him of downright hypocrisy. He declared that he merely came to Rome as a pilgrim, to visit the tombs of the apostles. — Leonis IX. Vit. a Nic. Arragon.

of Rome was reduced to the lowest state of poverty. The clergy had alienated the benefices to their own children, the barons had seized the estates ; Pope John had plundered the churches ; no pilgrims dared to approach with costly offerings. The money which Bruno had brought from home was soon exhausted. His German followers showed a disposition to desert their poor master, of whose wealth as Pope they had doubtless entertained magnificent notions : a timely offering by some wealthy votaries from Benevento, who had heard of the Pope's virtues, relieved his immediate necessities. Public confidence was restored, the Pope went on performing all the great and imposing acts of his Office, the consecration of wealthy abbots, the confirmation of privileges to remote monasteries ; and, doubtless, the grateful oblations began again to flow into the papal treasury. Of his measures to resume the usurped possessions of the church the records are silent. But the great object of his saintly care and ambition was the reformation of the corrupted church. He devoted himself to wage implacable war with the two dominant evils of his time, as they were esteemed by all zealous churchmen, simony and concubinage. A council met at Rome : again the severer prelates proposed by one sweeping interdict to annul the orders, and to degrade every clerical person who was in any way implicated in simony, who had made any gift, payment, or contract to obtain a bishopric, or other office in the church.¹

¹ On the notoriety of the simoniac proceedings at Rome : —

“ Heu sedes Apostolica
Orbis olim gloria,
Nunc, pro dolor ! efficeris
Officina Simonis.”

Damian, lib. iv. Epist. ix. p. 109.

But again it was found that the times would not endure these summary remedies. It would have deprived almost the whole of the clergy; and as, by annulling their orders, it rendered all their acts invalid, every sacrament, ordination, consecration; it absolutely interrupted, or rendered doubtful the whole spiritual succession of the order.¹ The Pope, either from the gentleness of his disposition, or from the necessity of the times, was obliged to adopt more lenient measures, to accept certain penances from the delinquents, and on confession, humiliation, and absolution, to restore the offender to his function or dignity.

The general concubinage, or rather marriage of the clergy, no less embarrassed the austere reformers.² It was determined that the clergy of Rome should no longer live scattered about in private houses, but in colleges or separate dwellings, and so be submitted to rigid superintendence and discipline. Women convicted of unlawful intercourse with the clergy were to lose their freedom and become slaves attached to the Lateran palace.³ But these were not the worst vices of the clergy.

¹ "Ita ut non solum ab ipsis, sed a plerisque diceretur episcopis, omnes pene basilicas sacerdotalibus officiis destitutas, et præcipue missarum solemniam ad subversionem Christianæ religionis, et desperationem omnium circumquaque fidelium funditus omittenda." — Damiani, Liber Gratissimus, c. 35.

² "Perrarus inveniretur qui non esset uxoratus vel concubinatus. De simoniâ quid dicam? omnes pene ecclesiasticos ordines hæc mortifera bellua devoraverat, ut qui ejus morsum evaserat, rarus inveniretur." — Vit. S. Joann. Gualberti. Non erubescabant sacerdotes uxores ducere, palam nuptias faciebant, nefanda matrimonia contrahebant et legibus eas dotabant, cum quibus secundum leges nec in unâ domo simul habitare debebant. — Bruno Sign. ap. Murator. pp. 346, 347.

³ Et quæcunque damnabiles feminae intra Romana mœnia reperirentur Presbyteris prostitutæ, deinceps Lateranensi palatio adjudicarentur ancillæ. This may have been somewhat later in 1051. — Petri Damiani Epist. ad Cunibert. Taurin. Episc.

The stern ascetic Peter Damiani, who now comes forward the absolute unswerving model of monkhood, presented a book to the Pope, the title of which expressed in the coarsest form the unnatural vices widely prevalent among the monks as well as the secular clergy, a book which would shock a more sensitive age, but was received by the Pope as an honest and bold exposition of the morals of the times.¹

Damiani's blind monastic fury perceived not that the argument of his repulsive book was against himself. His remedy, the prohibition of marriage, was not likely to correct this frightful state of things. The Bishops at a synod in Rome acquiesced in the prohibition of marriage, but took no steps to enforce it. Of the worse evil, perhaps wisely, they were silent.² The German Pope might appear to turn his back in horror and disgust from the scenes of such vices. He would seek elsewhere for devout and rigid minds, which might console him by their holy sympathy; and some were yet to be found in every part of Europe, either on the episcopal throne, or in the rigorous cloister.

The saintly ambition therefore of Leo did not confine his views for the reformation of the Church to the city of Rome or to Italy. He aspired to comprehend the whole of Latin Christendom under his personal super-

¹ The title of one chapter is enough to show the nature of this odious book, the Gomorrhianus of Peter Damiani — 'De diversitate peccantium contra naturum.' No detail is spared. Compare Leonis Epist. prefixed to Damiani's book. The wiser Alexander II. stole the book and shut it up. Of this Damiani complains bitterly. — Epist. ii. 6.

² Sub anathemate interdictum est, . . . ut sacerdotes et Levitæ et subdiaconi cum uxoribus non cœant: quæ res magnum veterosum serpentem concitavit in iram. Quod audientes episcopi primo quidem veritati non valentes resistere tacuere; postea vero, suadente humani generis inimico, inobedienter celavere. — Bonizo, p. 803.

intendence. Though now hardly seated firmly in his throne at Rome, he resolved to undertake, as it were, a religious visitation of Western Europe, to show himself in each of three great kingdoms as the Supreme Pontiff, as the equal or superior of all secular princes ; and that in all the genuine characteristics of power, the protection of the oppressed, the redress of grievances, the correction of abuses, the punishment even of the haughtiest and most powerful offenders against the statutes of the church, the suppression of simony, the restoration of monastic discipline. Some of Leo's predecessors had indeed crossed the Alps, either to obtain by personal supplication the assistance of the Transalpine sovereigns against their enemies ; or to take part in the secular or ecclesiastical affairs of those kingdoms. Latterly the Popes had dwelt in their remote seclusion at Rome, and that seclusion alone had permitted the reverential imagination of the world still to invest them in some lingering sanctity. Yet rumors and the reports of the pilgrims could not but disseminate through Europe, even to its remotest parts, the degraded character of the Italian Popes ; the rapacity, the licentiousness, the venality had become more and more notorious. How some Popes had lived, how they had died, could not be altogether disguised. This had been proclaimed in full synods of Transalpine prelates, as at Rheims. The difficulty of reconciling the loftiest spiritual offices, the holiest functions, with the most unholy life, could not but force itself upon the religious mind of Christendom.

Leo came forth to Europe, not only with the power and dignity, but with the austere holiness, the indefatigable religious activity, the majestic virtue which

became the head of Christendom. His personal character and habits would bear the closest and most jealous inspection: he was not merely blameless in morals, but exemplary in the depth and intensity of his devotion. Wherever he went he visited the most severe of the clergy or of the monastic orders, men Leo's visitation beyond the Alps. already sainted by the popular devotion; like St. Gualberto of Vallombrosa,¹ and the successor of the holy Odilo at Clugny. All recognized a kindred spirit, and hailed the genuine Pontiff. He passed by Florence; he held a council at Pavia; he crossed the Alps to Germany. Throughout Germany his time was occupied, till he reached Cologne, in consecrating A.D. 1049. March 14. churches, and bestowing privileges on monasteries. On his arrival at Cologne he was received by the Archbishop Herman, the Chancellor of the Empire, with the greatest state. Herman was a prelate of a kindred spirit, pious, and disposed to hierarchical magnificence; both himself and the Pope knowing, no doubt, the influence of the splendid ecclesiastical ceremonial on the popular mind. The Pope created a new and high office for the Archbishop of Cologne, the arch-chancellorship of the Apostolic See. The archbishop became a kind of northern Pope; seven cardinal priests were appointed daily to read mass, sandalled, at the altar of St. Peter in the cathedral. At Cologne appeared the pious Emperor, Henry III., in military array; he was engaged in war with Godfrey, Duke of Upper Lorraine, and a powerful confederacy, comprehending Baldwin of Flanders, and Herman of Mons, and Theodoric of Holland, secretly supported by Henry I., King of France. Godfrey had been already

¹ See the Lives of S. Gualberto.

under the ban of the Empire for expelling his brother from his inheritance, the dukedom of Lower Lorraine. He had been defeated and pardoned. But when, on the death of his brother, the Emperor granted away the dukedom of Lower Lorraine to Frederic of Luxemburg, he again rushed to arms. With his lawless allies, he had destroyed the imperial palace at Nimeguen, and burned Verdun. But their predatory bands had suffered a defeat by the forces of the Bishops of Liege, Metz, and Utrecht.

Leo scrupled not to smite with his spiritual arms the enemy, the rebel against the Empire, who was accused of burning churches in his marauding warfare. He excommunicated Godfrey of Lorraine; and that turbulent prince, who had defied the authority and the power of the Emperor, bowed in awe beneath the spiritual censure. He came to Aix-la-Chapelle, where the Pope advanced to receive him; he came as a humble suppliant. The Pope with difficulty extorted his pardon, but not the restitution of his dukedom, from the resentful Emperor. But Godfrey was broken in spirit by the appalling presence of the Pope; he went to Verdun, and submitted to the most humiliating penance: he was publicly scourged before the altar, in order to obtain a readmission into the church. He was condemned to rebuild the cathedral which he had burned; and the fierce marauder was seen laboring like a common workman in the repairs of the ruined church.

Nor was the religion of Leo IX. too lofty or spiritual for his age; he was as deeply involved in its superstitions. The ecclesiastical Hercules, who travelled about beating down the hydra heads of clerical avarice and licentiousness, is surrounded, like him of old, with an

atmosphere of mystic legend. Leo was the most sure discoverer of reliques, wherever it was desirable that reliques should be found ; wherever he prayed for them, the bodies of saints came to light. His life was a life of visions ; miracles broke out on all great, sometimes on more insignificant occasions.¹

Germany had received with submission, not unmingled with pride, the holy German Pope. The German clergy, on the whole, stood higher than that of any other part of Latin Christendom. The religious character of the reigning Emperor, Henry III., had maintained at least superior decency of manners ; he had discouraged simony, and advanced the more religious of the clergy. But when the austere Pope proposed to pass into France, to visit Rheims, the king and the clergy heard with equal dismay of the ^{Leo IX. in} unwelcome design. In France, with the exception of some exemplary prelates, the hierarchy were more feudal in their tenures and in their habits : the benefices had fallen into the hands of warlike nobles, more secular than ecclesiastic in their lives ; they were obtained by more questionable means, devoted far less exclusively to religious purposes. The king, no doubt, at the suggestion of his clergy, excused himself from this unwonted visitation, on the plea that his bishops and abbots, with the rest of his feudal array, had been

¹ The most remarkable miracle, of later date, was this. A precious cup, presented to him by the Archbishop of Cologne, fell on the ground and was broken to pieces. At the word of Leo the pieces came together, the cup was again whole, and the fracture was only marked by a thin thread (capillo). But the most extraordinary part was, that all the while not a drop of the liquor was spilled. The authority for this was Hugo, Archbishop of Besançon, an eye-witness, who piously stole the cup from the Pope "devoto furto." Wibert, ii. 6. It is related in a Papal diploma, and was avouched by Gregory VII.

summoned to attend his banner against the hostile Normans.

The courteous pertinacity of the Pope would not admit the excuse. As bishop of Toul he had pledged himself to be present at the consecration of the new and splendid church at Rheims, and the removal of the remains of the holy St. Remi; as Pope he was bound to fulfil his pious engagement. St. Remi was the popular saint of France, equal to St. Martin of Tours, superior to that host of saints which had been canonized by the early zeal of the Franks during the reigns of the Merovingians. St. Remi had baptized Clovis, and so had expelled Arianism from the kingdom of France. Nothing could deepen so much the reverence for the Pope throughout that part of France as his devout respect for St. Remi. The abbot Heriward had been summoned on his allegiance to attend the royal array: the king was obliged to dismiss him, when advanced some days' march, to attend on his sacred functions.

The Pope came to Rheims: nothing could surpass the pomp of the ceremonial for the consecration of the church. It was the day of St. Remi, the day on which, in ordinary years, pilgrims crowded from all quarters of the world to the shrine of the tutelary saint of France. It was a time singularly well chosen for the papal visit. Such vast multitudes thronged from all sides (at the council there were representatives of England, no doubt many English among the zealous votaries) that the Pope was obliged to address them from the roof of a house. The church was with the utmost difficulty cleared for the performance of the ceremony; the pious spectators trampled each other under foot. The Pope himself supported for a time

the chest or coffin which contained the inestimable bones of St. Remi, during the long procession which awed, delighted, prostrated in reverence and elevated in pride as the possessors of such wonder-working reliques, the countless worshippers.

The consecration of the church was the preliminary to a council summoned to meet at Rheims. Oct. 3.

The council was not imposing for its numbers; it reckoned but twenty bishops, including the strangers, and about fifty abbots; the rest were engaged in following the royal wars. A strife for precedence arose between the Metropolitans of Treves and of Rheims. Treves had but recently received the title of Primate from Leo himself; Rheims asserted his immemorial primacy over the Church of Gaul. The prudent Leo refused to decide the question. The four Archbishops of Treves, Rheims, Lyons, and Besançon sat in a circle around the Pope.¹ The Cardinal-Deacon opened the conclave, declaring the subjects which demanded the grave consideration of the assembled fathers: simony, the unlawful possession of clerical benefices by the laity, marriages within the prohibited degrees, desecration of churches, irregular divorces and second marriages, the abandonment of their vows by monks, the military services of the clergy, the plunder and imprisonment of the poor, unnatural crimes, and certain heresies which had arisen in France. Every prelate present was summoned, under pain of the papal anathema, if he was conscious of any guilt of simony, openly to confess his sin. The Archbishop of Treves arose and made his protestation in the most solemn

¹ There were present three English dignitaries: Dudic, Bishop of Bath, the Abbot of St. Augustine in Canterbury, and the Abbot Alvisius.

terms. He was followed by Halinard, the venerable Archbishop of Lyons, who had declined the papacy; and by the Archbishop of Besançon. All eyes were turned on Guido of Rheims, who sat in suspicious silence. Guido arose, and demanded a delay until the next morning, that he might have some private communication with the Pope. His request was granted. The turn of the Bishops came. All declared their innocence except Pudicus of Nantes, Hugo of Langres, Godfrey of Coutances, Hugo of Nevers. The examination of their offences was adjourned to the next sitting. The Abbots were not so scrupulous or not so exempt from guilt. Heriward of Rheims declared his own innocence. Even Hugh of Clugny, though he called God to witness that he had no concern in any simoniacal contract, acknowledged that there were suspicious rumors abroad concerning him. Of the rest, some who could not excuse themselves, endeavored to palliate or conceal their crimes. One, Arnold of Poitiers, accused of grave offences, was deposed. The Cardinal-Deacon, then under the menace of the same apostolic anathema, demanded whether there was present any man who held any one besides the Pope to be the head of the Catholic Church. There was a profound silence: the traditionary passages of the canons were then read, on which was grounded the right of the Pontiff of Rome to the primacy of the Church.¹ It was then proclaimed that the Pope forbade any one, under pain of anathema, to leave Rheims, without his permission, before the close of the council.

The following morning Guido of Rheims, before the

¹ Was this, as it were, to exorcise Rheims from the evil doctrines proclaimed at the former council under the influence of Gerbert?

opening of the synod, had his private conference with the Pope. Notwithstanding this he was summoned again by the Cardinal-Deacon to answer on the question of simony, and other grave offences, of which he was publicly accused. Guido answered not; he demanded a consultation with his friends, he retired with the Archbishop of Besançon, the bishops of Angers, Soissons, Nevers, Senlis, Morin (Boulogne). On his return he demanded that the Bishop of Senlis should be heard in his name. The Bishop of Senlis came forward and declared that the Archbishop of Rheims was not guilty of simony. The Pope demanded that he should take the oath: so had his holy predecessor Gregory the Great required of Maximus of Salona. Guido struggled in the toils, again he requested delay: the Pope, content with his humiliation, granted it on condition that in the next spring he should appear to answer before a council at Rome. The other charges were allowed to fall from want of proof. But the bishops escaped not so easily. Hugo of Langres was arraigned not only for simony, but for murder, whoredom, and unnatural crimes. Witnesses were at hand to prove these monstrous wickednesses. The bishop confessed the simony, but repelled the other accusations; the examination of these charges therefore was postponed till the next sitting of the council. Before that sitting Hugo of Langres had fled; he was solemnly cited; he was sought for in his lodgings in due legal form by the Bishops of Senlis and Angers; he was deposed and anathematized as guilty of contumacy. Hugo of Nevers acknowledged that his father had given a large sum of money to purchase his bishopric. Since that time he could condemn himself for no of-

fence, yet he dreaded God's wrath, and was prepared to lay down, he did actually lay down, his pastoral staff at the feet of the Pope. The Pope was content with his oath, that at the time he knew nothing of the simony, and restored his staff. Godfrey of Coutances confessed that his brother had, without his knowledge, bought him his bishopric. As soon as he knew the fact, he had endeavored to fly ; but the people had brought him back by force. The council on his oath pronounced him innocent. Bishop Pudicus of Nantes confessed that his father, who had been Bishop of Nantes before him, had secured him the succession by bribery ; he admitted that by the same ungodly means he had obtained the ordination after his father's death. He was deposed, but in mercy allowed to retain the order of a priest. The council proceeded to condemn the bishops who had dared to disobey the papal summons to the council. The anathema fell on the Archbishop of Sens, the Bishops of Amiens and Beauvais ; the Bishop of Laon, the adviser of the King of France to impede the council, and the Abbot of St. Medard, who had left the council without the permission of the Pope. Their sees were declared void (the Archbishop had been forced upon his diocese by the King ; the Bishop of Amiens was a great hunter) ; the clergy and people proceeded to new elections. Among the other statutes of this council, chiefly the reënactment of former canons, one condemned a Spanish prelate, the Archbishop of St. James of Compostella, who had dared to assume the title of an Apostolic bishop ; and aspired, as Gerbert of Rheims to be a Gallican pope, to be the Pope of Spain.

The Norman historian sums up the acts of the Council of Rheims. Priests were forbidden to bear arms, or

to have wives. The bearing arms they gave up without reluctance; but even now they will not their harlots (such is the name with which their wives were branded), nor submit to chastity.¹

To the Gallican council at Rheims succeeded a German council, attended by forty prelates at Mentz, among these three great Metropolitans, Bardo of Mentz, Eberhard of Treves, Herman of Cologne, with Engelhard of Magdeburg, Adalbert of Hamburg and Bremen.² The Council of Mentz confirmed the acts of the Council of Rheims. The same strong resolutions Oct. 19. passed against simony and concubinage. Sibico, Bishop of Spire, was forced to take the sacrament in proof of his guiltlessness of simony. According to the biographer of Leo, Sibico's cheek was struck with palsy, and he bore for life the brand of his perjury.³ A contest for the archbishopric of Besançon was decided in favor of the Metropolitan Hugo, who had rendered such true allegiance to the Pope at Rheims. During his return to Italy, Leo either visited in person, or confirmed by statute, the privileges of many famous monasteries — Fulda, Lorsch, Moyen-Moutier, Altorf, Hirschau, Reichenau, Donauwerth.⁴ He passed Christmas in Verona.

¹ "Tunc ibidem generale concilium tenuit, et inter reliqua ecclesie commoda, quæ instituit, presbyteris arma ferre et conjuges habere prohibuit. Unde consuetudo lethalis paulatim exinaniri cœpit — arma quidem ferre presbyteri jam gratanter desiêre, sed a pellicibus adhuc nolunt abstinere, nec pudicitie inservire." — Orderic. Vital. Compare Vit. Hildeberti, in Act. SS. April 29: Alberic Destroisfontaines, Leibnitz, p. 89.

² Adam. Bremens. Hist. Eccl. ap. Lindenbrog. Mansi et Hartzheim, sub ann.

³ Wibert, Vit. Leon. ii. 5. The charge against Sibico, according to Adam of Bremen, was adultery.

⁴ Among the countless treasures of reliques bestowed on the church of Altorf, were pieces of the cradle, the tomb, and the garments of the Redeemer; of the vine which he had planted with his own hand! — of the

Leo IX. returned to Rome. In this single spiritual campaign, by the calm dignity of his holiness, by his appeal to the strong religious reverence of Christendom, he had restored the papacy to all its former authority over the minds of men. He had justly elevated the pride of Germany in having bestowed such a Pope upon the world, crushed the tendencies at least to rebellion in the churches of France and Spain, and brought them again into acknowledged subordination to the See of Rome. He carried back to Italy the respect and the obedience of the world to overawe any still unextirpated desire for the recovery of Italian spiritual domination ; to Rome the assurance of the most powerful Transalpine protection, to suppress the turbulent and mutinous spirit of her nobles and her people.

cross, — of the robe of the Virgin, and the beard of John the Baptist. All this and much more related as if with grave unsuspectingness (is it indeed grave unsuspectingness?) by Hoeftler, ii. p. 64. See also the discovery of the site of Hirschau.

CHAPTER II.

BERENGAR OF TOURS.

THE unity of Latin Christendom had been threatened during the dark age of the Papacy not only by the separation of the spiritual monarchy into independent dynasties, by the elevation of a Gallican and of a Spanish primate; the allegiance even of Ravenna and Milan to the supreme pontiff was doubtful and contested. Nothing could have preserved the papal supremacy if it had continued to descend in its line of lawless Roman princes. It might have been endangered even by a succession of German pontiffs of less energetic, commanding, and holy character than Leo IX. — pontiffs in whom the German nationality had predominated over their churchmanship — for Christendom would hardly have submitted long to the Pope, only an obsequious vassal of the German Emperor. More, however, than this, the unity of doctrine, that great system of imaginative Christianity which had so long ruled the mind of Latin Christendom, was menaced with a controversy which struck at the roots of its power, prematurely undermined in the hearts of men the greatest of those influences by which the hierarchy swayed the world, and might have led, long before Christendom was ripe for a more spiritual and intellectual religion, to a fatal disturbance of the traditional and dominant faith. The con-

troversy raised by Berengar on the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist, his protest against the new rigid form of Transubstantiation into which that doctrine had but recently been cast by Paschasius Radbert and his followers, was totally different from those which to this period had broken the unity of the Church. Sects from time to time had arisen and were still rising¹ in different parts of Latin Christendom whose opinions departed widely from the dominant faith. But the principle of these sects was, in general, separation from the Church; they were societies working in secret, withdrawing their members from the communion of the Church and from subordination to the hierarchy; bound together either by peculiar tenets or by some intuitive harmony of feeling and opinion; here organized under their own priesthood, there held together by aversion to the pride and to the vices of the established clergy; esteeming apostolic poverty and apostolic humility the only signs of apostolic truth and authority. Infinitely various, but with some leading kindred principles, these sects had one common character, they were sects. They either asserted each itself to be the sole true church, or, altogether rejecting the notion of a visible church, rested on the evangelic truth of their doctrines, on their conformity with the sacred Scriptures (never altogether abandoned as a distinct tenet); or they had inherited the yet unextinguished principles of Arian or Manichean opinions, the latter of which seem to have been constantly flowing by untraceable channels into the west. These sects were the authors, in different quarters of Europe, of wide-spread and still renewed revolt; but this revolt was still beaten down in detail by the

¹ This affiliation of these very obscure sects will be hereafter traced.

strong arm of ecclesiastical and temporal power : they were confuted by the irrefragable argument of fire and sword.

But the opinions of Berengar threatened a civil war — a contest within the Church, within the clergy itself. He declared that his was the true Catholic doctrine ; from his school at Tours he proclaimed a haughty intellectual defiance to all the other theologic schools of Christendom. He was himself probably unconscious of the ultimate bearing of his own views. He appealed to the clergy generally, in all likelihood as unconscious ; but who had an intuitive apprehension, equally alarming to the prudence of the cautious and to the sensitive jealousy of the devout, that they were descending from a higher to a lower ground — that the Sacrament, by this new or revived interpretation, was sinking in its majesty and in its efficacy. This Sacrament — the Eucharist — from the earliest times had withdrawn into the most profound mystery ; it had been guarded with the most solemn reverence, shrouded in the most impressive ceremonial. It had become as it were the Holy of Holies of the religion, in which the presence of the Godhead was only the more solemn from the surrounding darkness. That Presence had as yet been unapproached by profane and searching controversy, had been undefined by canon, neither agitated before Council, nor determined by Pope. During all these centuries no language had been thought too strong to express the overpowering awe and reverence of the worshippers. The oratory of the pulpit and the hortatory treatise had indulged freely in the boldest images ; the innate poetry of the faith had worked those images into realities. Christ's real Presence was in some indescrib-

able manner in the Eucharist ; but under the notion of the real Presence might meet conceptions the most dissimilar, ranging from the most subtle spiritualism to the most gross materialism ; that of those whose faith would be as profoundly moved by the commemorative symbols, which brought back upon the memory in the most vivid reality the one sacrifice upon the cross ; as that of the vulgar, to whom the more material the more impressive the notion, to whom the sacred elements would be what the fetiche is to the savage.

Between these two extremes would be the great multitude of believers, who would contemplate the whole subject with remote and reverential awe. To these the attempt at the scrutiny or even the comprehension of the mystery would appear the height of profane presumption ; yet their intuitive perception would shrink on the one hand from refining the holy bread and wine into mere symbols, on the other from that transubstantiation which could not but expose the actual Godhead to all the accidents to which those elements, not now merely corporeal, and with all the qualities of the human flesh and blood, but actually deified, might be subject. It was the fatal term Transubstantiation, first used (as is commonly, but it seems erroneously said) by Paschasius Radbert, a monk of Corvey, which startled some of the more reflective minds ; according to this term the elements ceased entirely to be what they still seemed to be to the outward senses. The substance of the bread and wine was actually annihilated — nothing existed but the body and blood of the Redeemer, the body and blood of the Redeemer resuscitated in the flesh, yet to which belonged the ubiquity, the eternity

of the divine nature.¹ Such a phrase could not but cause some reaction. But the leader of that reaction, Berengar, had surrendered himself as the humble pupil of the one great thinker, the one purely metaphysical intelligence, who during this period had been so much in advance of his age as almost to elude their theological jealousy.

It was impossible but that among the minds withdrawn into profound contemplation by monasticism, altogether secluded from practical intercourse with the world, there should be some in whom the severe intelligence should entirely predominate. Such men — the religious awe being less strong and less exclusively exercised than the logical faculty — would not be restrained from the cool analytic examination even of the most accredited theologic phraseology; they would subtly scrutinize the inward sense of words, reduce them from their rhetorical or poetic form to their present meaning; they would be, by mental constitution, the intellectual parents of the Nominalists in the twelfth century.

Of these the most remarkable was the Scotch or Irish monk, John Scotus or Erigena. Erigena was a philosopher of a singularly subtle mind: men wondered at this subtlety, which was so high above the general train

¹ Paschasius Radbert's Treatise is in Martene et Durand, t. ix. Paschasius, though perhaps his *theory* of Transubstantiation (he does not use the word) may be explained away into what is called Impanation (as by Ebrard, *Dogma vom Heiligen Abendmahl*, i. 406), certainly followed it out into its grossest consequences, the miracles of the Host bleeding, assuming a human form, that of a child, etc., c. xiv. Sirmond claims for him (in *Vitâ*) the merit of having first matured the full doctrine of the middle ages; others ascribe it to Lanfranc. The Schoolmen stripped off all the awfulness, and coldly discussed it in all its naked materialism. Compare Gieseler on Paschasius and on Berengar.

of popular notions as to command universal reverence rather than suspicion. But he had not only broken the bonds of Latin Christianity, he went almost beyond the bounds of Christianity itself. The philosopher dwelt alone in his transcendental world; he went fathoming on, fearless and unreprieved, in the very abysses of human thought; and, it is not improbable, had followed out his doctrines into that theory at which men in whom the rationalistic faculty prevails, and who are still under the influence of a latent religiousness, so often arrive. He had wrought out a vague Pantheism, singularly anticipative of that which in its various forms now rules in modern Germany. But we must at a later period revert to Erigena as in one sense the parent of scholasticism, but of scholasticism as a free, discursive, speculative science, before it had been bound up with rigid orthodoxy by Aquinas, Bonaventura, and Duns Scotus. Berengar, it should seem, with a weaker and far less original mind, had been caught in the logical trammels of Erigena, from which he could not escape. He was not without the pride which arises from the adoption as well as the discovery of new and apparently distinct views of mysterious subjects, as manifesting superior intellectual strength and acuteness (that pride is betrayed in his somewhat contemptuous challenge to Lanfranc), or he shrank from the coarser materialism which seemed enforced by the doctrines of Paschasius Radbert, and which had already encountered opposition from Rabanus Maurus, the monk Ratramn, and some others.¹ He proclaimed, as the true doctrine

¹ On the question of the authorship of the treatise ascribed to Scotus Erigena, and to the monk Ratramnus, compare Gieseler. The treatise of Scotus, if he wrote expressly on the subject, is lost. Compare Schröckh, *xxiii. 441, et seqq.*

of the Church, the counter definition of his master Erigena, which, asserting the real Presence, declared that real Presence spiritually conceived.¹

On the other hand, in the vast European hierarchy, there could not be wanting minds of equally Lanfranc. powerful logical subtlety, and trained in dialectic science, who would repress within themselves the rebellious intelligence; and in the confidence arising out of their infelt accordance with the dominant creed, with the sagacity, not merely timorous, but conscientiously jealous, which would tremble at any approach to the unsettling of great religious questions, or the diminishing of the sacerdotal power² (the only bulwark against brute force and blind ferocity), would espouse the established creed with the zeal and ardor of conscientious churchmanship. Such was Lanfranc, a native of Pavia, under whose learned government the Norman monastery of Bec was rising into fame; and Lanfranc himself was gaining that high character which designated him hereafter for the Norman primate of England. Some jealousy may have lurked in the mind of the master of the great school of Tours, which had so long enjoyed high reputation as a seat of theologic learning, against the upstart university, if it may be so called,³

¹ The discovery of the famous treatise of Berengar by Lessing, its recent publication at Berlin, furnishes us with Berengar's own distinct, deliberate statement of his views. It is a hard, harsh, obscure treatise, apparently little likely to awaken enthusiasm, or to attract devoted followers.

² Miracles were not wanting to refute Berengar. A priest saw and touched the form of a child on the altar. He kissed it; it resumed the appearance of bread. Berengar tauntingly said, "*Speciosa certe pax nebulonis, ut cui oris præberet basium, dentium inferret exitium.*" — Wm. Malmesb., p. 466.

³ See in Malmesbury the very curious account of the virtue, austerity, and sanctity of Berengar, by Hildebert, Bishop of Le Mans, p. 466.

among the yet barbarous Normans. In his challenge to Lanfranc, Berengar acknowledges the ability of that teacher with a haughty condescension, reproving him for the haste with which he has presumed to condemn the judgments of Erigena.¹

The opinions of Berengar were widely disseminated by the poor scholars² who wandered about the country from the school at Tours, and who were maintained at the cost of Berengar. By some they were heard with horror: he was accused, as usual, of opinions which he did not hold — of reducing the Holy Sacrament to a shadow, not a truth — of vague concubinage, and the denial of baptism.³ Others seem to have been overawed by the fame of his erudition. His first antagonist did no great honor to the cause of orthodoxy; it was Hugo, Bishop of Langres, the bishop condemned and degraded by the Council of Rheims for notorious criminality of life. Others wrote in a more respectful and expostulatory tone. The writings of Berengar himself have all the contemptuousness of a mind in which the severe and naked logical faculty has complete mastery, and which cannot comprehend that unison of faith and reasoning which commends itself to those in whom the religious sentiment maintains its power.

Lanfranc had his revenge for the insolent superiority May, 1050. assumed by Berengar. He was present at the Council in Rome held by Pope Leo IX. The

¹ "Hac ergo in re, si ita est, pater, indignum fecisti ingenio quod tibi Deus, *non aspernabile*, contulit, præproperam ferendo sententiam. Nondum enim satagisti in scripturâ divinâ, nec multum contulisti cum tuis diligentioribus." — Lanfranco Berengarius, apud Giles. Lanfranci Opera, Epist. 1.

² Jamque scatebat omnis Gallia ejus doctrinâ per egenos scolares, quos ipse quotidianâ stipe sollicitabat, disseminatâ. — Wm. Malmesb., iii.

³ Authorities in Mahillon, Analect., and Schröckh, p. 509.

opinions of Berengar were brought under discussion, but of those opinions there was no acknowledged or authoritative statement which could expose him to condemnation. Lanfranc, suspected (such was his excuse) of correspondence with the heretic, and thus implicated in his doctrines, produced the fatal letter in which Berengar avowed the opinions of Erigena, proclaimed the Holy Sacrament, as it was asserted, and inaccurately asserted, to be but a figure and a similitude.¹ Berengar was condemned at once; he was commanded to appear at the Council summoned to meet at Vercelli. But to Vercelli Berengar came not;² he had ap-
Sept. 1050.
pealed to King Henry of France for protection: he was imprisoned by that monarch in order, as he himself states, to extort money from him; nor would he submit to be judged out of his province. He had not merely proselytes, but fanatical followers. The Church of Tours sent one of their body to deprecate the hasty wrath of the Pope; he was accompanied by a renowned clerk of Burgundy, named Stephen.³ Words ran high:

¹ Compare Vita Lanfranci apud Giles. Oper. Lanfranc., i. 188. There his friends are said to have sent the letter after him, and that Lanfranc, suspected of heresy on account of his correspondence with Berengar, produced the letter.

² It is remarkable with what supercilious contempt Berengar writes of the Council of Vercelli, even of Leo IX. He denies the right of the Pope to summon him to be judged beyond his metropolitan province. He accuses Leo of having lodged with the Bishop of Vercelli, who was living in open adultery with the wife of his uncle, a nobleman of Pavia, and of having refused to take cognizance of the charge publicly made by his uncle against the bishop. — p. 40. By an adverse writer he is reported to have spoken with equal scorn of the Pope and of the see of Rome: "Nempe S. Leonem P. non Pontificem sed pompificem et pulpificem appellavit, S. Romanam Ecclesiam vanitatis concilium et Ecclesiam malignantium, Romanam sedem non apostolicam sed sedem Satanæ dictis et scriptis non timuit appellare." — Bernald. de Berengar. damnatione. Gieseler has quoted the whole passage, p. 285.

³ "Dissuaserant secundum ecclesiastica jura, secundum quæ nullus extra provinciam ad judicium ne cogendus est ire."

to Lanfranc's learned arguments it was replied, that he who rejected the conclusions of Erigena rejected the words of St. Augustine.¹ One of Lanfranc's party, who branded Berengar with the name of heretic, the Canon of Tours declared, in the name of Almighty God, to be "a liar." But notwithstanding this bold resistance, the Council of Vercelli passed its censure both upon Erigena the master, and the disciple Berengar.

But Berengar treated the excommunication of the Pope and of the Council with sovereign contempt. His disdainful language towards the Pope offended even his friends. He charges his antagonists with ignorant or wilful misrepresentation.² In France his opinions divided the public mind; one distinguished prelate, Bruno of Angers, openly espoused his doctrines; they were favorably received by Froilant of Senlis. The king vacillated between the condemnation of Berengar and tacit connivance at his opinions. Two Councils were held, one by the Duke of Normandy, whom Berengar had endeavored to win over, at his castle of Brion: of this synod the date and the proceedings are but vaguely known. Berengar is said to have withdrawn discomfited, and admitting the truth of the established doctrine. The second was summoned by the king at Paris. There the Bishop of Orleans, the adversary of Berengar, took the lead. The tenets of Berengar and the book of Scotus were denounced by wild acclamation; and it was declared, that, if Berengar did not re-

¹ Much of the treatise "*De Sacra Cœnâ*," is devoted to the proof that his own doctrines and those of Erigena were the same as those of Ambrose and Augustine.

² Berengar bitterly complains of the misrepresentation of his doctrines: "*Humbertus enim ille tuus, inaudito me . . . scripsit quod voluit, et quod meum non erat, mendaciter meum esse confinxit.*"

cant, the clergy would summon the array of the kingdom, march at its head, besiege Berengar in whatever fortress or city he might take refuge, compel him to recant, or to surrender himself as prisoner. But the name of Erigena stood high in France; he had always been held as the most honored divine at the court of Charles the Bald. The king hesitated, and took no further measures for the restraint of Berengar.¹ It was not till towards the close of Leo's life and pontificate that the alarm grew so great at Rome that no less than Hildebrand himself, the cardinal sub-deacon of the Church, now rising towards that height of fame, afterwards to exalt him above all the world, was sent as legate into France to compose that dangerous feud. Hildebrand, with his natural intrepidity, summoned a Council at Tours, to assail his adversary in April, 1054. his stronghold. But at Tours Hildebrand, instead of taking the high ground of authority, condescended to become persuasive and conciliatory; he was content with an ambiguous declaration extorted from Berengar, that after consecration the bread and wine were really the body and blood of the Lord.² With this, and with a faint expression of his determination to carry Beren-

¹ "Ego interim dico: panem et vinum per consecrationem converti in altari, in verum Christi corpus et sanguinem, non mea, non tua, sed evangelica apostolicaque simul autenticarum scripturarum quibus contra ire nefas, est sententia." He subjoins lower: "Quam diceres conversionem . . . minime assignasti." — p. 57. See against Material Transmutation, p. 173. In more than one place Berengar states that he had disguised his opinions for fear of death. — p. 73. See also the distinct view of Berengar's opinions, p. 274. Compare De Sacra Cœnâ, pp. 52, 53.

² He states that before Hildebrand: "quod jurarem, panem atque vinum altaris post consecrationem sunt corpus Christi et sanguis. Hæc me sicut re proferrem, juramento confirmavi, corde tenui." It was the *material* change which he rigorously and constantly opposed, by every argument of obscure, indeed, and tortuous logic, but still with unaccommodating rigor.

gar with him to Rome, Hildebrand closed his part in this momentous controversy. The secret is clear: Hildebrand was wanted at Rome; his place was there.¹ The King of France was bringing forward in his council questions of great political importance, an accusation against the King of Spain, and a demand of aid against that King from the Emperor. The Council might be interminably protracted, and Pope Leo was in the utmost peril; his army had been defeated, he was a prisoner; if released, released only to die.² Besides the fatal effects of his humiliation, his macerations had begun to threaten his life; to those so deep in the politics of Rome the progress, the fatal end of his disease might be known by sure prognostics.

But we must reascend two years to Leo, still in the full activity of his youth, still endeavoring to command the whole Latin world by his presence. His aspiration was still to be Pope of Christendom, not of Rome only (though, as will hereafter appear, he had great schemes for the aggrandizement of the Pope in Italy): so during this period he visited rather than took up his residence, or fixed his court, in Rome. Three times, during his pontificate of five years, he crossed the Alps; once already he had been seen in Germany and at Rheims; the second Transalpine visitation took place immediately after the council of Vercelli. Its ostensible object was a great religious ceremony in honor of the

¹ Hildebrand had ordered all the books bearing on the subject to be collected: "Ut ex eorum auctoritate satisfieret de eucharistiâ pro eujus diligentiori consideratione et veritatis, Dei misericordiâ, comprehensione hæreticis me insinulaverant homines nihil scientes, et superiores se in scientiâ alios non æquo animo tolerantes." — p. 52.

² According to Berengar, p. 53, he had heard of the actual death of Leo: "Nunciatum illi est, Papam Leonem rebus decessisse humanis."

city of which he was still the bishop. The German Popes had introduced a singular kind of plurality, as if the Teuton felt insecure in his Roman see, and still reserved a safe retreat in his native land. Clement II. had retained the bishopric of Bamberg; Leo Oct. 21, 1050. had been several years Pope before he vacated that of Toul.

No gift could be bestowed on a city or on a church of equal value with that of a popular saint; the city grew in honor and in wealth. Not merely were its own citizens more under the influence of the clergy from this increased devotion, but it became a place of pilgrimage; multitudes flocked annually to the shrine with their offerings, and not seldom a profitable commercial mart grew up to the advantage of the town. Gerard had been bishop of Toul; he had reposed for fifty-six years in his tomb. During a ceremonial, as solemn as that which had installed the holy St. Remi in his new shrine, the tomb of Gerard was opened. The body was found in perfect preservation. An altar was consecrated to the new saint; wonderful cures were not wanting; privileges were lavishly bestowed on the favored church, and on the clergy of the favored see.

The Pope again visited some of the great cities of Germany, everywhere making munificent grants, confirming the rights and possessions of monasteries. He was at Treves and at Augsburg; at the Feast Feb. 2, 1051. of the Purification of the Virgin met the Emperor and the Pope. But enemies of the Pope had now arisen at the court of the Emperor. Leo IX. was too much of a German Pontiff for the Italians, not German enough for his countrymen. The Germans, during the reign of the Franconian emperors, had possessed themselves

of some of the wealthiest sees in Italy, as well as of that of Rome.¹ A German held the see of Ravenna ; and under his episcopate Ravenna had begun to renew her ancient pretensions to independence of Rome. Leo, in the true Roman spirit, would not endure the encroachments even of a German prelate, raised to his see by the special favor of the Emperor. The Italian prelates at Vercelli joined eagerly in the humiliation of the German at Ravenna ; Humfred was degraded and excommunicated by the Pope and Council. At this act the brooding jealousy against the Pope broke out at the court of Henry into open hostility. Bishop Nitger of Freisingen, a magnificent prelate, whose revenue, if in part dedicated to less sacred uses, was splendidly employed on ecclesiastical buildings, during some warm dispute relating to the affair of Ravenna, grasping his neck, said, “ May a sword cleave this throat if I work not the ruin of this Pope.” The biographer of Leo adds that the bishop² was seized with a pain in the neck, and died in a few days. At Augsburg the Pope was compelled to submit to the restoration of his haughty antagonist. Humfred, it is true, was ordered to make restitution of all he had unlawfully usurped from the Pope, to acknowledge his supremacy and to request his forgiveness. He knelt ; “ According to the depth of his repentance,” said the Pope, “ may God forgive him his sins.” The prelate rose, and broke out in scornful laughter. Tears filled the eyes of the Pope. “ Miser-

¹ Hoefler has drawn out a list of German prelates, by which it appears that the Patriarchate of Aquileia, the Bishoprics of Como, Padua, and Verona, were a long time almost exclusively in their hands : other sees less frequently. — *Beilage*, xvii. p. 333.

² This must have been much later, as Nitger survived the Archbishop of Ravenna some time.

able, he is a dead man !” Humfred returned to Ravenna, fell ill, and in a few days died, not without strong suspicions of poison.¹

The third journey of Leo IX. beyond the Alps was as mediator between the Emperor Henry and Andrew King of Hungary. Fifty years had elapsed since that formidable people the Hungarians had been converted to Christianity. St. Stephen, their king, had wrought this almost sudden change. Stephen was the son of a Christian mother, Sarolta, herself the daughter of Gyula, who had been converted by a monk of Constantinople, Hierotheus. King Geisa, father of Stephen, seems to have hovered between the old Magyar religion of his subjects and his new faith. Stephen was not baptized in his infancy ; the holy St. Adalbert administered to him that redeeming rite ; he received the Christian name of Stephen ; he obtained the hand of a Christian bride, Gisela, the daughter of the Emperor Otho. On the death of Geisa, an insurrection of the Magyars against the foreign councils and the foreign faith was suppressed. The Christian King ascended the throne ; his first act was to unite himself to Latin Christendom ; he sent an embassy to Pope Sylvester II., and received the present of a crown, and a Papal edict empowering him to regulate the ecclesiastical offices of his realm. He was crowned King of Hungary at Gran. Throughout the land rose churches : the nation received the religion of their Sovereign. Stephen, during his reign of thirty years, continued in the practice of that faith

Stephen King, 1000-1036. 1052, Leo's third journey to Germany.

Conversion of Hungary.

¹ Gfrörer, with somewhat dubious charity, labors to exculpate the Pope from all share in this crime, of which no candid man can have the least suspicion. He lays it to the hostility of the Italians, who were jealous of their bishoprics being turned into German fortresses for the oppression of Italy.

and of those virtues, which acquired for him the name and renown of a saint. But Peter, the successor of Stephen, did not rule, he was ruled by German and Italian priests. The rude and warlike people had indignantly thrown off the yoke. The unhappy king was dethroned, blinded; Andrew and Levanta, two princes of the royal race, were placed on the throne; heathenism became again the national religion; everywhere the old altars rose; the Christians were persecuted; some priests and bishops suffered martyrdom. But on the death of Levanta, Andrew boldly declared himself a Christian; he was crowned by a Christian bishop (probably the native bishops had been permitted to remain); he restored the churches, and prohibited heathenism on pain of death.

The Emperor Henry had espoused the cause of the dethroned Peter; on his death he declared Hungary a fief of the empire. Andrew offered tribute, it was rejected with scorn. At the instigation of Henry, himself engaged in the war with Godfrey of Lorraine, his uncle Gebhard, Bishop of Ratisbon, led a marauding expedition into Hungary. He was defeated; but the Count of Bavaria and Adalbert Margrave of Austria entered into the war. It was waged with greater yet not with conclusive success. Haimbourg the frontier town was taken and retaken. Henry himself in the year 1051 headed a campaign without important result, the next year he advanced with a more overwhelming force, and laid siege to Presburg. Pope Leo appeared in his camp to reconcile the temporal head of Christendom¹ with a king who had restored the Christianity of

¹ An Hungarian prelate, Coloczy, had been among the bishops present at Toul, perhaps as ambassador, secret or avowed, of King Andrew to the Pope. Compare throughout Mailath, *Geschichte der Magyaren*.

his realm. But his mediation was rejected by Aug. Sept. both parties. He urged on the Emperor the terms of submission and tribute, offered by the Hungarians; Henry coldly and contemptuously declined the conditions. But the tide of war turned, the Hungarians sunk the provision ships on the Danube, upon which the army of the Emperor depended for their subsistence; and now the Hungarian in his turn refused the humiliating concessions which he had offered before. The Pope withdrew, not without some loss of dignity; the peace was not established till the following year, and then without his interference. At Ratisbon during the close of this year Pope Leo pursued his favorite avocation, the canonization of Saints. Two bishops of that city, Erhard and Wolfgang, were installed in that honor with the usual imposing ceremony.

Christmas was celebrated by the Pope and the Emperor, and many of the great prelates of Germany, at Worms. They met not merely to celebrate A.D. 1052. the birth of the Redeemer with more than Pope Leo at Worms. usual magnificence, but on secular affairs of great, it appeared of vital importance to the Pope. Leo, though maintaining his hold on Transalpine Christendom, had not neglected the affairs of Italy. Those affairs in which he appeared in a new character, and of which he was perhaps the victim, must be unfolded hereafter. He aspired it is clear to restore the Pope to his rank as an Italian Potentate, to become something more than a secular vassal of the empire, something beyond the spiritual monarch of Christendom. The See of Rome laid claim to many wealthy churches and abbeys,¹ either

¹ See the list of 31 churches and 47 monasteries, besides some allodial estates, in Muratori's *Antiq. v. Dissert.* 96. — Hoefer, p. 367.

as the pious donations of the founders, or as the grants of emperors. Among these were the famous Abbey of Fulda, and the bishopric of Bamberg.¹ Leo agreed to surrender these endowments in exchange for the city and territory of Benevento, stipulating at the same time for a strong imperial force to put him in possession of that city, and to enable him to subdue the formidable and hostile Normans.

But the Antipapal party at the court of Henry had grown in strength and in bitterness of hostility; the more the Pope became an Italian, and the more he asserted his independence, the more odious he became to the great German prelates. His most attached friend and most powerful supporter, the holy and charitable Bardos, the Archbishop of Mentz, was dead; the Emperor of his own authority had appointed Liutpold, Provost of the Chapter of Bamberg, to this German primacy. The Pope had bestowed, in order to propitiate the new primate, some further privileges on the See of Mentz. The archbishop was the Papal Legate in his own diocese. But as if he knew the character of Liutpold, he took the opportunity of this grant to remind him of the duties of his function. A trifling incident betrayed the mutual jealousy of the German and Italian churchmen, the difficult position of the Pope, who having rashly favored the insolent superiority of the Italians, was obliged to humble himself before the sullen obstinacy of the Germans. In the mass for Christmas day, the Pope read the service, the next day the Archbishop of Mentz, the Metropolitan of Worms, performed the function. The pro-

Bamberg,
Oct. 18.

¹ Gfrörer conjectures that the Bishopric of Bamberg was attached to the Papacy on the promotion of Clement the Second.

cession was ended, the archbishop had taken his seat, Humbert, a deacon of the archbishop, chanted the Gospel in a tone different from the Roman usage, perhaps jarring to Italian ears. The Italians requested the Pope to forbid him from proceeding in his dissonant chant: the Pope did so, but the deacon went on, disregarding the Papal mandate. The Pope allowed the Gospel to be ended, summoned the refractory deacon, and declared him deposed from his office: the archbishop instantly sent some of his clergy to demand the restoration of his deacon; the Pope declined. The service went on, it was the time for the elevation of the Host. The archbishop sat stubbornly in his seat, and declared that neither he himself, nor any other should proceed with the office. The whole ceremony paused; the Pope was obliged to yield, his apologists said because he would not interfere with the rights of a metropolitan in his own diocese. The deacon was reinvested in his functions; the archbishop condescended to discharge the rest of his holy office.

But this, humiliating as it was, was not the most fatal mark of jealousy displayed by German churchmen against the unpopular Pontiff. At a council at Mantua, suddenly broken off, were undisguised A.D. 1053. signs of German hostility.¹ Gebhard, Bishop Quinquagesima. of Eichstadt, who was of great weight in the councils of the Emperor, persuaded him to withdraw the greater part of the troops, which were to march with the Pope

¹ At the council of Mantua the uproar against the Pope was not on account of the married clergy, against whom stronger measures were threatened, but the attempt of the Pope to obtain a sponge declared to contain the blood of the Lord. This accompanied the reliques of S. Longinus, the soldier who pierced the side with his spear. Compare Theiner, vol. ii. p. 32.

into Italy, and put him in possession of Benevento.¹ The Pope had influence enough to retain in his service 500 Swabian knights. With these, and assembling around his standard, as he went, a host of lawless adventurers and mercenaries, the holy Leo marched through Italy to appear at the head of his own forces, the first or almost the first martial pope, against the terrible Normans. The Italian policy of Leo, bold, aggressive to a certain degree, had been justified by success. In the reconquest of Sardinia from a new invasion of the Saracens, his admonitions and advice had encouraged the Pisans to achieve the conquest. In the neighborhood of Rome he had not been able to subdue the fierce barons, who still maintained the fastness cities, and awaited their time: a Crescentius still held Tusculum. But Southern Italy offered a more promising field for the extension and consolidation of his sovereignty. It was held by three powers mortally hostile to each other, the Greeks, the Saracens, and the Normans. Of these the Saracens, by recent feuds, had been so weakened, that Leo, in his lofty visions, began to dream of the reconquest of Sicily to Christendom. The Greeks, almost in despair of maintaining their ground against the Norman adventurers, had vainly sought recourse in craft. They endeavored to bribe them with enormous pay to enter into their service and engage in new wars in the East. But the Normans knew their strength: this body of men, who had arrived in Italy as pilgrims, had now become sovereigns of many cities; they warred impartially on all.² The

¹ Floto (Kaiser Heinrich der Vierte, i. p. 179, published 1856) assigns some reasons, the dangers and difficulties of Henry in Germany, for that advice.

² On the settlement of the Normans in Italy read the curious chronicle,

deliverance of Southern Italy from these half christianized and barbarous freebooters seemed to justify to Pope Leo even his warlike propensities. His first incursion into the South had been of a more peaceful, more seemly character ; but it had opened to his ambition views which matured slowly to the close of his life. In the second year of his pontificate, he had again visited Monte Casino, and held a synod at Salerno. At his approach the city of Benevento threw off May, 1050. the yoke of its sovereign prince, Landulf of Capua. Leo hesitated not to accept the popular surrender ; and to receive the city as part of the domain of St. Peter. The faction of the Capuan regained possession, Leo excommunicated the rebellious city. He was now by the Imperial grant Lord of Benevento. He was at the head of an army, enlisted to expel the Normans from the land. He wrote to the Greek Emperor, Constantine Monomachus, to declare the reasons which urged him to undertake this war in person. In his martial ardor he forgot the theologic controversy,¹ which was rising to its height with the patriarch of Constantinople Michael Cerularius ; the controversy, which prolonged

'Li Normans,' published by M. Champollion Figeac. Soc. de l'Histoire de France.

¹ For this controversy between Humbert Cardinal Bishop of Silva Candida, legate at Constantinople, and the clergy of Constantinople, which ended in haughty words on both sides, see Leonis Epist. apud Mansi xix. Canisii Lectiones Antiq. One of the strongest objections against the Greek Church was the marriage of her clergy. The Latin replies: "Hæcine quoque sunt illa majora et perfectiora, ut novus maritus et recente carnis voluptate resolutus et totus marcidus Christi ministret altaribus, et ab ejus immaculato corpore sanctificando manus confestim ad muliebres transferat amplexus. . . . Pro quibus omnibus et aliis, quos longum est scripto prosequi erroribus, nisi resipieritis et digne satisfeceritis, irrevocabile anathema hic et in futuro eritis a Deo et ab omnibus Catholicis, pro quibus Christus animam suam posuit." — Compare the answer by Nicetas. Apud Canis. pp. 301-314.

for centuries the schism between the Greek and Latin churches. While the vital question as to the nature of the Sacrament threatened to distract the West, the East broke off all connection with a church which dared to use unleavened bread in that solemn rite. The Normans, thus wrote Leo to the Emperor, that undisciplined and foreign race, were still ravaging Christian Italy with more than Pagan impiety ; they spared neither age nor sex, and not merely slew the Christians indiscriminately in promiscuous fray, but put them to death slowly with indescribable tortures. They made no distinction between things sacred and profane ; they plundered, burned, razed churches. Princes, according to the apostles, were not to bear the sword in vain ; and as a prince Leo went out to war ; not that he desired the death of a single Norman, nor of any human being, but by the terrors of human judgments, these unbelievers must be taught the terms of God's judgments.¹

In his youthful days, Leo had acquired some fame for military conduct ; he had commanded the vassals of the bishopric of Toul in one of the Emperor Conrad's expeditions into Italy. Some vain self-confidence may have mingled with the zeal which induced him to lead his own army against the enemies of the faith² — an act at which some of the more religious stood amazed, and did not disguise their utter repugnance. The stern recluse Peter Damiani protested with all his natural energy.³

¹ Leo IX. Epist. Constant. Monomach. vii. ; Labbe, p. 982.

² " In illius itaque sæcularis militiæ dispositione, sic repente sagax apparuit et providus, quasi hujusmodi negotiis tantum fuisset hætenus exercitatus." — Wibert, i. 7.

³ Damiani lays down this irrefragable proposition: " Si ergo pro Fide, quâ universalis vivit Ecclesia, nusquam ferrea corripitur arma conceditur, quomodo pro terrenis ac transitoriis Ecclesiæ facultatibus loricatæ acies in

The conduct of Leo in the campaign belied his early fame. The sagacity and forethought, formerly ascribed to him, utterly failed. Not that he actually took the generalship of his troops in the battle, but all the movements seem to have been made under his guidance. From San Germano he advanced to Capua, accompanied by many bishops, by Frederick of Lorraine the Chancellor of the Empire, the Duke of Gaeta, the Counts of Aquino and Teano. Thence he marched into the Capitanata, the stronghold of the Normans. The Apulians and other Italians flocked to his standard. He had an interview with Argyrous, the Greek Catapan of Calabria, who promised his succor. He fixed his quarters at Civitella, and launched his first ^{June 18,} blow, the excommunication of the Normans. ^{1053.}

The Normans either were, or pretended to be, appalled by these vast preparations. They offered terms of submission. These were peremptorily refused by Frederick of Lorraine: the only condition offered was their total abandonment of Italy. The Pope saw not the danger of driving them to despair. He pushed forward his troops to the banks of the Furtorio, near Dragonata. The German troops were not above 500. The terrible Normans mustered 3,000 knights, men who were said to be able to cleave an enemy from the head to the saddle

gladios debacchantur. "When the saints have power they do not even slay heretics and infidels." He proceeds to condemn Leo IX.: "*Ad hæc si quis objiciat, bellicis usibus Leonem se frequenter implicuisse Pontificem, verumtamen sanctum esse. Dico quod sentio, quoniam nec Petrus ob hoc Apostolicum obtinet principatum, quia negavit; nec David idcirco prophetiæ meretur oraculum, quia torum alieni viri invasit.*" It is curious to read Damiani's commentator, trying to make out that Damiani does not condemn the Pope's using the sword as a temporal prince. How would the old Saint, who compared Leo's wars with the denial of Peter, and the adultery of David, have scorned this distinction? — Damiani, *Epist.* iv. 9.

with one blow. They were commanded by the sons of Tancred, Humfrey, Richard of Aversa, and the yet unrenowned Robert Guiscard. Three days the armies watched each other. While the negotiations were pending, the Normans occupied a hill, on which depended the fate of the battle. The fourth day they burst down in three squadrons. The Lombards, on one wing, the Apulians on the other, fled at once: the Germans were surrounded and cut to pieces to a man.

The Normans rushed from the field to seize the Pope at Civitella. An accidental conflagration repelled them for that night: the next day they entered the town. The humbled Pope at once relieved them from their excommunication: they became again sons of the Church. Was it religious awe, or was it subtle policy, which made them at once her obsequious sons? The rude soldiery perhaps from dread, the leaders from that craft in which the Normans excelled as much as in valor, cast themselves down before the Pope, entreated his pardon, professed deep penitence. But they lost no time in securing again all the cities which had thrown off their yoke. Count Humfrey, the gentlest of the sons of Tancred, remained as gaoler, or as an attendant on the Pope. Leo was allowed to visit the battle-field,¹ to bury his own soldiers with the honors of martyrs. He declared that he had heavenly visions of their glory, as having died for the faith. The Normans themselves afterwards assisted in building a church over their remains. The Pope was conducted with all respect by Count Humfrey to Benevento: there he remained, a

¹ The battle was fought June 16, 1053. Leo set off for Rome March 21, 1054.

prisoner, though treated with the most profound outward reverence, for some months.

Heart-broken at the failure of all his schemes ; perhaps now conscious of his own unclerical conduct, in becoming the leader of an army ; seeing the divine condemnation in his abasement, his imprisonment, notwithstanding the courteous and deferential demeanor of the Normans ; knowing that he was absolutely in their power, the pious Leo betook himself to the severest acts of penitential austerity. He wore nothing but sackcloth ; he slept on a carpet, with a stone for his pillow, the few hours which he allowed for sleep. Every day he performed mass ; almost all the rest of the day and night was passed in prayer and the recital of the Psalter. He did not absolutely neglect his ecclesiastical functions ; he appointed a new abbot of Santa Sophia, in Benevento. He kept up a correspondence with Africa, with Constantinople, with the most remote parts of Latin Christendom ; but his chief occupation, besides his prayers, was works of charity. His admirers glorify his imprisonment with many miracles. But his sorrow and his macerations had wasted all his strength ; the hand of death was upon him. The Normans, perhaps out of compassion, perhaps lest they should be accused of the death of the Pope while in their hands, were willing to release the dying man. On the 12th of March he left Benevento, under the escort of the Norman Humfrey. He was obliged to rest twelve days at Capua. He arrived at Rome, but repressed the universal joy by melancholy intimations of his approaching death, too visibly confirmed by his helpless condition. His calm departure reaches sublimity. He ordered his coffin to be carried to St. Peter's ;

he reposed on a couch by its side. There he gave his last admonitions to the ecclesiastics around, entreating them to abstain from simony and the alienation of the estates of the Church ; there he received the last sacraments. He rose with difficulty, and looked into his coffin. " Behold, my brethren, the mutability of human things. The cell which was my dwelling when a monk expanded into yonder spacious palace ; it shrinks again into this narrow coffin." The next morning he was dead. He died before the altar of St. Peter's. As might be expected, his death had been announced by visions : monks had beheld in their dreams angels in white robes by his bed-side. Wonderful cures immediately followed his departure. A devil, who had possessed a Tuscan woman for above nine years, confessed that Leo had already ascended to heaven, and that it was by his power that he was driven forth. A woman laughed this tale to scorn ; she was seized by the expelled fiend and compelled to pray to the new Saint. The lame, the dumb, the lepers, were brought from all parts of Italy to touch his remains. Churches were built to his honor in Benevento, in Toul, and in many other cities.

April 13,
1059.

CHAPTER III.

CONTINUATION OF GERMAN POPES.

HILDEBRAND having concluded his hasty treaty with Berengar, but not leading with him, as he had threatened, the captive heretic, travelled with the utmost speed to Rome. Pope Leo, it is said, had bequeathed the administration of the see, during the vacancy, to the Cardinal-subdeacon ; but tumults were threatened, or actually broke out : the party of Benedict, the old Roman party, was not extinct. According to one account, it made a bold attempt to regain its power. Hildebrand was too wise as yet to aspire to the unsafe dignity. The Pope must be a wealthy prelate, for the larger part of the papal domains were still in the hands of the baronial plunderers. An Italian pope of the most awful piety, of the most determined energy, would only have wielded spiritual weapons, to which those lawless men had been too long habituated, not to laugh them to scorn. The Pope must command the imperial protection, without which Rome might at any time become the prey of the Normans. That terrible race had again resumed their hostile aspect ; their ally, the Count of Reate, had not scrupled to seize and imprison, on their return from Constantinople, the future Cardinal Frederick of Lorraine and the other legates of Pope Leo. The Pope would have become the slave, he had not yet learned

the wiser policy of being the patron and ally of these barbarians. After some months it was determined to send an embassy to the Emperor, at the head of which was Hildebrand himself, to implore his nomination. But Hildebrand had already determined upon his choice — a Pope who might meet the exigencies of the times, and whose election would so flatter the Emperor, that he would hardly refuse to concur cordially in the appointment. Gebhard of Eichstadt was one of the richest, undoubtedly the ablest of the German prelates. Gebhard might be considered the remote cause of the discomfiture of Leo at Civitella, and of his premature death. He it was who had advised the Emperor to countermand the march of the great body of his troops to the support of Leo. He had veiled this act of jealous hostility to Leo under affected scorn of the Normans; “with two hundred knights he would chase them from Italy.” If Gebhard could command the German troops to retire, he could command them to advance in these perilous times to the rescue of Rome.

The rise of Gebhard of Eichstadt to power and influence had been rapid and extraordinary. Gebhard, Bishop of Ratisbon, the uncle of the Emperor, had demanded for his favorite, Cuno, the succession to his see. From some latent cause, on the pretext that Cuno was the son of a married priest, Henry refused the nomination, but endeavored to propitiate his uncle by leaving the appointment absolutely in his power. The Bishop of Ratisbon immediately named Gebhard, a remote descendant of the noble house of Calw. To the Emperor’s objection against his extreme youth, the bishop replied with prophetic sagacity, that Gebhard would rise to still higher honors. This vaticination

began immediately to give promise of fulfilment. The Bishop of Eichstadt showed consummate abilities ; he was of the greatest service to the Emperor in most difficult circumstances, particularly during the Hungarian war. He became his most intimate and confidential counsellor.

It was a great stroke of policy to secure the full exertion of the imperial power for the reinstatement of the Pope in the dignity and security of his office ; to repel the Normans, perhaps to wrest back from their unworthy possessors some of the estates of the see : while at the same time it deprived the Emperor of a counsellor who was most likely to give success to his policy, to the German policy, of retaining the Pope in obsequious vassalage to the Empire. It might be boldly predicted from the ambition and abilities of such a Pope as Gebhard, that after the great work of the reëstablishment of the papacy was completed, the Churchman, as in his predecessors, would predominate over the faithful subject, the Italian Pope over the German Liegeman. Gebhard foresaw the danger, shrank from the temptation ; he had rather remain the commanding counsellor than the equal, the rival, it might be the enemy, of his master. He yielded to the pressing entreaties of Hildebrand and the Romans, and of his Imperial sovereign, only after long delay, only on the significant terms that the Emperor would restore the rights and possessions which he held belonging to the Papacy. This speech implied the pledge of his assistance to recover ^{April 13,} those usurped by others. A whole year had ^{1055.} elapsed before the successor of Leo IX. was inaugurated at Rome under the name of Victor II.

The Emperor followed his Pope into Italy at the

head of an imposing and powerful array. But a new enemy had arisen, if not more formidable, more hateful to the Emperor than the Normans or the usurpers of the Papal estates. Godfrey the Bearded, the deposed Duke of Lorraine, had been Henry's ancient antagonist. Godfrey, anathematized by Leo IX., deserted by his allies, had submitted to the loss of his hereditary dukedom; he had led an aimless and adventurous life. One of the acts which was considered as betraying hostility to the Emperor in Pope Leo, had been the elevation of Godfrey's brother, Frederick of Lorraine, to the Cardinalate, and to the highest honors of the Church. Godfrey had accompanied his brother, the Cardinal Legate, on his mission to Constantinople. On his return he married Beatrice, the widow of Boniface, Marquis of A.D. 1052. Tuscany, who had been murdered a few years before. The whole inheritance of that family, the most powerful in Italy, the inheritance which, afterwards falling to the famous Countess Matilda, was the great source of the independence and overweening power of Gregory VII., was at the command of the Emperor's implacable enemy. The depression of the house of Lorraine was the one object which now occupied the Emperor. The mother and her daughter fell into his hands. Godfrey of Lorraine was forced to abandon his Italian possessions; he fled to Germany, to stir up more perilous revolt against the Imperial authority. The Cardinal Frederick, pursued by the implacable jealousy of the Emperor, did not find himself safe even in the holy sanctuary of Monte Casino. He took refuge in a more unapproachable monastery in the rocky island of Thormita, to emerge in a short time, under other circumstances, as the Supreme Pontiff.

Pope Victor II. held a council in the presence of the Emperor at Florence, then an unimportant May 27. city. Besides the ordinary denunciation against simoniacal proceedings, and a new sentence against the excommunicated Berengar, a decree was passed which attempted to strike at the root of that evil which impoverished the papacy, broke up the Church property into small pieces, and made laymen the actual possessors of the estates of the Church. It prohibited, under pain of excommunication, all bishops and abbots from granting the estates of the Church as fiefs to knights or nobles. The Pope set the example of this new proceeding; on the falling in of the fief of Spoleto and Camerina, he became himself the Marquis. He proceeded, no doubt under the awe of the protection of his imperial master, to resume other lands which had been rashly and fraudulently granted away in the more turbulent periods to the barons of the Romagna.

But, whether from his severity in the condemnation of simony, the enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline, or the threatened resumption of the estates of the Church, the Italian hatred to a German pope soon found a man bold and guilty enough to endeavor the murder of Victor. A subdeacon mingled poison even with the blood of the Lord in the Eucharist; the story took the form of legend; the Pope could not lift the chalice; he entreated the prayers of the faithful to enable him to investigate the cause of this wonder; the affrighted culprit fell on his knees and confessed, or, as it was said, the demon who possessed him confessed his guilt.

The Emperor, on the news of threatened insurrection, had hastened back to Germany. Instead of de-

scending again in the next year to Italy, he sent messenger after messenger pressing the return of his one faithful and wise counsellor to Germany. The Empire was in open or secret revolt in many parts. Godfrey of Lorraine had organized an insurrection; France threatened war: the Pope hastened to the aid of his old master. He arrived at Goslar to receive his confession, to administer the last Sacraments. The Emperor, in consequence of violent exertion in the chase, had caught a fever, which, working on a mind

Oct. 5, 1056. harassed by the perplexing state of affairs,
(Oct. 28.) brought him to the grave. He died, forgiving all his enemies, making restitution of all which he had unjustly possessed, bequeathing his infant son to the care of the Pope. He was buried by the faithful Pope at Spire.

Victor II., Gebhard of Eichstadt, was now in power both Pope and Emperor; his wise moderation appeased the angry conflict in Germany. He reconciled Baldwin of Flanders to the young king by a timely concession of his hereditary dukedom. He allayed the enmity

June, 1057. of Godfrey of Lorraine; he gave no offence

Oct. 29, 1055. to those who were most likely to take offence at this preëminent elevation of one of their own order, the great prelates of Germany; he raised the celebrated Adalbert into a metropolitan of Northern Germany, as Archbishop of Hamburg. He sent Hildebrand again into France to reform the Church, to depose the simoniacal prelates, to wrest the power and the wealth of the clergy out of the hands of the laity. In Italy it had already, before the Emperor's death, begun to appear

Nov., Dec., 1055. that the Pope now wielded the power of the Empire. He had made a progress into the

March of Ancona as Duke of Spoleto and Marquis of Camerina and Fermo, and of the March of Ancona. He raised his tribunal, and was received with the utmost submission; many of the unruly barons attended obsequiously upon his court. He summoned the Count Teuto and his sons for unlawfully withholding the castle of La Vitice from the Bishop of Teramo. The contumacious Teuto not appearing, the judge of the Pope declared him in rebellion, pronounced against him the ban of the Empire and of the Pope, and gave orders to take the castle by force. These proceedings were not always carried out without strong murmurs. Peter Damiani, in one case thought himself called upon to intrude his remonstrances, and to admonish Pope Victor as to the observance of more equal justice. It was an ungrateful return to God who raised Victor to the favor of the Emperor, and had now invested him with imperial power, to abuse that power, to despoil unrightfully a man who had withdrawn from the world and dedicated himself to Christ.¹ But at the summons of Pope Victor a large Synod of bishops from Northern and Central Italy met at Florence ^{April 18,} 1057.

—those of Florence, Arezzo, Nocera, Castello, Popilia, Sienna, Vercelli, Turin, Eugubio, Velletri, Fiesole, Pisa, Pistoia. Of the acts of this Synod nothing is known, but the presentation of Frederick of Lorraine, fallen into such disgrace with the Emperor Henry III., but now wisely restored to favor, as Abbot of Monte Casino to the Pope. Frederick was received with the utmost courtesy, confirmed as abbot, and at the same time acknowledged as the Cardinal of St. Chrysogonus in

¹ Damiani, *Epist.* i. v. The circumstances to which Damiani alludes are unknown.

the Roman Church. The ambition of Victor rose with his power ; his grants assume a loftier tone ; the Apostolic throne of Peter, the chief of the Apostles, is raised high above all people and all realms, that he may pluck up and destroy, plant and build in his name. He was preparing again to cross the Alps to arrange, in his character of guardian of the Empire, with the Empress Agnes the affairs of Germany ; he was meditating a second great Council at Rheims, to accomplish the reform in the Church of France. He suddenly died at Arezzo, and with him expired all these magnificent schemes of universal rule.

July 28,
1057.

When the unexpected intelligence of Pope Victor's death arrived at Rome, the Cardinal Frederick of Lorraine had not departed to Monte Casino. The death of Victor caused almost a vacancy in the Empire as well as in the Papacy. The Empress mother alone, now deprived of her ablest counsellor, and her young son, represented the Franconian Cæsars. The House of Lorraine was in the ascendant ; not only had Duke Godfrey been permitted to resume his hereditary rank and title, Victor, the Pope, had either from policy consented, or yielded through fear, to admit Godfrey and his wife Beatrice of Tuscany as joint representatives of the Empire, and as rulers of Italy. Frederick of Lorraine was not a Roman, not even an Italian, but he was the hereditary enemy of the Imperial House ; he had suffered persecution from the late Emperor. The Romans determined to seize the occasion of reasserting their privilege of themselves creating the Pope without regard to the permission or sanction of the Emperor. Hildebrand was absent ; and as they still hesitated, they consulted the Abbot of Monte Casino concerning the

future Pope. Frederick of Lorraine named no single prelate ; he embarrassed them (if indeed the whole was not well understood between the parties) with the choice among five prelates, Humbert Cardinal Bishop of St. Rufino, the Bishops of Velletri, of Tusculum, and of Perugia, and the Subdeacon Hildebrand. It was proposed to await Hildebrand's return ; but the dominant party would hear of no delay. They declared none of these to be equal to the Papacy ; Frederick of Lorraine himself must be the Pope. "Be it as you will," said the unresisting Abbot, "ye can only do what God permits you to do." Five days after the death of Victor, Frederick, under the name ^{Stephen} of Stephen IX., was inaugurated in the church ^{Pope,} ^{Aug. 2, 1057.} of St. Peter ad Vincula, and installed amid universal joy in the Lateran Palace. Frederick of Lorraine was a churchman of the sternest and haughtiest views. As the Legate of Leo IX. at Constantinople, he had asserted the Roman supremacy in the strongest terms. He had anathematized the Byzantine Church in language which, notwithstanding that the policy of the reigning Emperor Constantine Monomachus, intent on retaining, as an ally of the Pope, his small remaining territory in the south of Italy, led him to endure any degradation of his Church by the representatives of the Pope, eventually tended to widen the irreparable breach between the East and West. He drew up, with his colleagues, a paper which he solemnly deposed on the high altar of St. Sophia, which, while it condescended to admit that among the pillars of the realm and the great dignitaries of the state, they had found much true faith and orthodox doctrine ; the so-called Patriarch and his followers were sowing the seeds of all imaginable

heresies. Like the Simonists, they sold the grace of God: like the Valesians, they appointed men whom they had castrated not only to the priesthood but to the episcopate;¹ like the Arians, they rebaptized those who had been baptized before in the name of the Holy Trinity, even Latin Christians; like the Donatists, they declared that without the Church of Byzantium was no true Church, the sacraments were of none effect: like the Nicolaites, they permitted carnal union to priests: like the Severians, they declared the law of Moses accursed, and cut off from the article about the Holy Ghost his procession from the Son as from the Father: like the Manicheans, they asserted that whatever is leavened has life. Like the Nazarines, they so highly respect the purification of the Jews, that they do not baptize children who die before the eighth day, and do not administer the communion to women who are in danger during childbirth; if heathens, do not baptize them. Finally, they do not, because they themselves wear their hair and beard long, admit to the communion those who, according to the Roman usage, clip their hair and shave their chins. "Accursed therefore be Michael, miscalled Patriarch, Leo Bishop of Acrida, and all their followers, with those of Simon, Vales, Donatus, Arius, Nicolaus, Severus, with all the enemies of God and the Holy Ghost, the Manicheans and Nazarenes, and all heretics, yea with the Devil and his Angels. Amen! amen! amen!" With this protest Frederick of Lorraine and the other legates had shaken the dust from their feet, and left guilty Constantinople.

The Abbot of Monte Casino was a rigid monk as

¹ Compare on this extraordinary charge against these Valesians (Valentinians, qu.?) the letter in Mansi.

well as a haughty churchman: the appointment of Peter Damiani, the austere champion of clerical celibacy, the sworn enemy of the married clergy, to the cardinalate, showed to the world the inclination of his mind on these great points, on which the Church was plunging into a mortal contest.

But the secular prince, the heir of a German dukedom, was not sunk either in the monk or in the churchman. Pope Stephen IX. had great schemes at once for the deliverance of Italy, for the elevation of his own family, perhaps some undetected desire of revenge against the house of his enemy, Henry III. He proposed, by the aid of Godfrey, now in possession of the marquisate of Tuscany, to expel the Normans from Italy, and afterwards to elevate Godfrey, the deliverer and master of Italy, to the Imperial throne. But great means were necessary to arm a force sufficiently powerful to subdue the Normans. The Abbot of Monte Casino (he was still Abbot) remembered the vast treasures which the piety of centuries had accumulated in the vaults of Monte Casino (though once plundered by the Saracens),¹ the votive offerings to St. Benedict, whom every devout monk considered his spiritual ancestor. He caused these treasures to be conveyed to Rome: he intended to devote them to this sacred crusade. But as he surveyed them religious terror seized his mind; visions were not wanting in which the holy Benedict and his sister Scolastica appeared to pious worshippers to protest against and to denounce this sacrilegious alienation of their riches. In an agony of remorse the Pope sent back the whole, except one picture, which himself had brought from Constantinople. The

¹ Leo Ostien.

secret of this conduct is clear: it was the consciousness of failing health which repressed the bold ambition of the Pope. On St. Andrew's day, but four months after his election, he had retired to Monte Casino. At Christmas, Christmas, 1057. mas he was seized with a violent illness, and was at the point of death. Already had he begun to take measures for the administration of affairs after his decease. On his return to Rome in February, Feb. 10, 1058. an access of returning health reawakened his paralyzed ambition. But the hand of death was upon him. He set off for Florence, turned aside to visit the holy Gualberto in his retirement at Vallombrosa, and after a few days died in his arms.

The death of Stephen IX. was no sooner announced in Rome than each faction took its measures. The Imperial party sent a submissive message to the Empress Agnes, laying the nomination at the feet of her and of her son. But the old Roman feudatory barons, who had been already compelled to relax their hold on some of the wealth of the Church, saw at once their opportunity to seize the Papal election again into their own hands. The minority of the Emperor gave them courage. The Count of Tusculum, the Count of Galeria, the Crescentii of Monticello rose without delay. John Mincius, the Cardinal Bishop of Velletri, had been one of the five prelates named by Cardinal Frederick of Lorraine on the death of Victor II.: he was of the famous house of Crescentius. Him they persuaded or compelled to accept the dignity. He was hastily inaugurated, enthroned by night, and took the name of Benedict X. From him they proceeded to extort the most lavish grants. They plundered the treasures, no doubt on the specious pretext of purchasing the good-

will of the people. The sacred oblations of St. Peter were not secure; the hammer of the coiner was heard beating up those holy ornaments into money. The cardinals present protested, and fled from Rome. Cardinal Humbert of St. Sabina and Peter of Tusculum returned from the burial of the Pope: they found Benedict on the throne, the Romans submitting to a Roman Pope. They withdrew in all haste to Florence, to concert measures with him whose master-mind they had begun to acknowledge. Hildebrand was accidentally at the Imperial Court, on a mission from the late Pope; he would have no difficulty in rousing the resentment of the Empress against this usurpation, this insult, after the nomination had been offered by the Romans. She empowered him to proceed to a new election. Hildebrand alleged the specious reason of visiting the tomb of his late benefactor, the deceased Stephen IX., to delay in Florence. There he enlisted in the same cause the ancient enemy of the Imperial House and of the Empress, Godfrey of Lorraine, the Marquis of Tuscany. Rivals for the Empire, these two potentates had a common interest in wresting the appointment to the Papacy from the lawless Romans, a common worldly interest, if not a religious dread of seeing the Papacy, notwithstanding the high character of the Pontiff elect, designated by the former Pope as one of the five most worthy ecclesiastics, sink to its former degradation. The choice skilfully adapted itself to the hopes and passions of both parties. It was Gerard, a Burgundian, a fellow-student of the Lorrainer the late Pope Stephen IX., now the Archbishop of Florence, and therefore connected no doubt with Godfrey, who heartily concurred in the choice.¹

¹ Annitente Gothofredo duce. — Leo Ostien. iii. 12.

The price of the concurrence of the Empress was a secret stipulation to crown her son as Emperor. The anti-Pope took the name of Nicolas II. He moved to Sutri, escorted by Godfrey of Tuscany, supported by Guibert of Parma the Chancellor of the Empire, whom he had summoned to attend at Sutri in a council of Jan. 1059. bishops. Pope Benedict was declared excommunicate, Nicolas II. the rightful Pope. Resistance was vain. Nicolas II. advanced to Rome: he was received with apparent joy by the clergy and the people; the barons had disappeared with their plunder.

The Pontificate of Nicolas II. witnessed the two Nicolas II. Pope. great changes in the Papal policy, which laid the foundations of its vast mediæval power — the decree for the election of the Pope by the Cardinals of Rome, and the alliance with the Normans. With the aid of the Hagarenes (so are the Normans called) Nicolas besieged his rival in Galeria. The Count of that fortress repented of his rashness in offering protection to the Pope Benedict. Benedict ascended the walls; he began to make signs, to utter curses against the Roman people. “You have forced me, against my will, to be your Pope; give me security for my life, and I will renounce the Pontificate.” Thirty Roman nobles pledged themselves as his guarantees for life and limb, for his safe reception in Rome. Nicolas, at the head of his army, returned to Rome; his rival followed, having stripped himself of his pontifical robes, and found a retreat with his mother, who lived near the April 13. Church of S. Maria Maggiore. Thirty days after Hildebrand the archdeacon seized him by force, and placed him before Nicolas and a council in the Lateran church. They stripped him before the altar

of his pontifical robes (in which he had been again invested), set him thus despoiled before the synod, put a writing in his hand, containing a long confession of every kind of wickedness. He resisted a long time, knowing himself perfectly innocent of such crimes: he was compelled to read it with very many tears and groans. His mother stood by, her hair dishevelled, and her bosom bare, with many sobs and lamentations. His kindred stood weeping around. Hildebrand then cried aloud to the people,—“These are the deeds of the Pope whom ye have chosen!” They rearrayed him in the pontifical robes, and formally deposed him. He was allowed to retire to the monastery of S. Agnes, where he lived in the utmost wretchedness. They prohibited him from all holy functions, would not allow him to enter the choir. By the intercession of the Archpresbyter of S. Anastasia, he was permitted at length to read the Epistle; a short time after, the Gospel; but never suffered to celebrate mass. He lived to the Pontificate of Hildebrand, who, when informed of his death, said, “In evil hour did I behold him; I have committed a great sin.” Hildebrand commanded that he should be buried with pontifical honors.¹

Immediately on his accession, while he was yet in his strength, supported both by the Imperial power and by the Marquis of Tuscany, while Rome and the barons were depressed by their late discomfiture, Nicolas II. summoned a council, the second Lateran A.D. 1059. council in Rome. A hundred and thirteen April 13. bishops obeyed the call. The first decree of this

¹ *Annales Romani*, first, I believe, published by Pertz, vol. v. Pertz thinks that these annals had been seen by Baronius.

assembly wrested at once the power of nominating the Pope from the lower clergy, the turbulent barons, and the populace. It left to the people and to the Emperor a barren approbation, but it vested the actual election solely in the higher clergy. With the cardinal bishops was the initiative; the assent of the cardinal priests and deacons was first required, then that of the laity, and finally that of the Emperor.¹ The higher spiritual aristocracy took the lead, the others were to be their humble followers.² Besides this, it established a kind of prerogative right in the Roman clergy to the Pontificate: only in default of a fit person within that Church was a stranger to be admitted to the honor. Rome was to be the place of election; but even Rome, by tumult or by contumacy, might forfeit her privilege. Wherever the cardinals were assembled, there was Rome. It had been at Sienna or at Sutri. In case the election could not take place within the city — and of this they were the sole judges — the cardinals, assisted by some of the religious clergy and religious laity, even though few (their religion would be their fidelity to their party), might proceed elsewhere to the election. The Imperial rights were reserved vaguely and ambiguously.³

¹ "Nimirum cum Electio illa per Episcoporum Cardinalium fieri debeat principale *judicium*; secundo loco jure præbeat clericus *assensum*; tertio popularis favor attollat *applausum*; sicque suspendenda est causa, usque dum regie celsitudinis consulatur auctoritas: nisi, sicut nuper contigit, periculum fortassis immineat, quod rem quantocyus accelerare compellat." — Peter Damian. i. Epist. xx.

² "Et ideo religiosissimi viri præduces sint in promovendâ pontificis electione: reliqui autem sequaces." The religiosity unhappily was estimated solely by rank in the Church.

³ "Cardinales Episcopi, cum religiosis clericis, Catholicisque Laicis, *licet paucis*, jus potestatis obtineant eligere Apostolicæ sedis pontificem, ubi congruere viderint." — Conc. ii. Lateran. Throughout, however, there is a

This decree, and an anathema of more than usual terror (the most dreadful imprecations in the Scripture were selected with sedulous care), was ratified by the consent of all, by the signature of above 70 bishops, with many other ecclesiastics. The anathema condemned the offender against the statute to irrevocable excommunication, to be counted among the wicked to all eternity. "May he endure the wrath of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that of St. Peter, and St. Paul, in this life and the next! May his house be desolate, and no one dwell in his tents! Be his children orphans, his wife a widow, his sons outcasts and beggars! May the usurer consume his substance, the stranger reap his labors; may all the world and all the elements war upon him, and the merits of all the saints which sleep in the Lord confound and inflict visible vengeance during this life! Whosoever, on the other hand, shall keep this law, by the authority of St. Peter is absolved from all his sins." Yet two years were hardly passed, when on the death of Nicholas a contested election distracted the Church of Rome; and some of the subscribing bishops are found in each furious faction.

The same Council, the second Lateran Council, which had thus made provision for the unity of the church by a new form of election, which had wrung the misused power from a lawless and irresponsible body, and seemed to repose it in security in the most holy and intelligent of the sacerdotal order; aspired also to establish the endangered unity of doctrine, and authoritatively to decide the most perilous theolog-

respectful reservation of the imperial right: "*Salvo debito honore et reverentiâ Henrici, qui in presentiarum rex habetur, et futurus imperator speratur.*" The last clause cited above has in the copy in Pertz: "*Ubi cum rege congruentius judicaverunt.*" — Pertz, *Leges*, ii. App. p. 177.

ical controversy which had arisen in Latin Christendom. Berengar of Tours had been persuaded or compelled to appear before the Lateran Council. He had his choice between death and the recantation of his tenets. But logic makes no martyrs. The temperament of Berengar's mind was not that of a reckless fanatic.¹ He fairly confesses that the fear of death extracted from him the humiliating admission of his errors; he accepted a creed equivocal according to his view, and elusive of the main question, in which the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist was distinctly asserted, though not in the strongest terms of transubstantiation. No sooner was he beyond the power of his adversaries, than Berengar recanted his recantation; reassumed the contemptuous language of a superior mind towards Pope Nicolas himself; reasserted the doctrines of his master Erigena, whom in the presence of danger he had not hesitated to forswear. But though the decree of the Lateran Council had no effect on Berengar, it had for a short time the effect of almost suppressing his doctrine.² Yet as will appear, it was not altogether swallowed up in the more absorbing question, the marriage of the clergy.

¹ Compare Berengar's own account of these proceedings: he claims the victory, and boastfully avers that, by their own terms, the bread, as he had always asserted, remains after consecration. — p. 70 *et seq.* “Dum dicitur, *panis* in altari consecratio, vel *panis* sanctus, *panis* sacrosanctus est Christi corpus, omni veritate panis superesse conceditur.”

² Among the most bold of Berengar's assertions was his protest against the assumption so perpetually made, that a certain doctrine, because supported by the majority, is the doctrine of the whole Church. He boasts multitudes who hold his opinions: “Quod nomen Ecclesiæ totiens ineptorum multitudini tribuis, facis contra sensa majorum: — quod dicis omnes tenere hanc fidem — contra conscientiam tuam dicis, quam latere non potest, usque eo res agitata est, quam plurimos aut pæne infinitos esse cujuscunque ordinis, qui tuum de sacrificio Ecclesiæ execrantur errorem, atque Pascasii Corbejensis Monachi.” p. 27.

By the decree of the Lateran Council the popedom was restored to Italy, to Rome. The great organized and simultaneous effort of the higher Clergy, to become as it were the chief feudatories and to choose their monarch had been successful. But the decree of a Council was only a mass of idle words, unless the Papacy could command some strong military force to secure its independence against domestic and against foreign foes. Either the Emperor must still dictate, or the Roman barons overawe the election. The Pope with all his magnificent pretensions was but a defenceless vassal, a vassal dependent on foreign resources for his maintenance on his throne.

The second great act of the pontificate of Nicolas II. was the conversion of the hostile, the unbelieving Normans, into the faithful allies, the body guard of the Pope. The Normans were now in almost undisputed possession of the whole of Southern Italy; the Greek Argyrous, the last Catapan, the ally of Leo IX., had retired in despair, finding his dominions almost shrunk to the one faithful city of Reggio at the very verge of Calabria, to Constantinople. The Normans were not less politic than brave; they were not without superstition; their policy and their superstition might render them the allies, the protectors of the Papacy. Robert Guiscard, the most powerful of the Norman princes, no doubt knowing how such ad-
Alliance with the Normans, June 24, 1059.
vances would be received, sent an embassy

to Rome, to request the revocation of the ban of excommunication, still in force against his Normans. The Pope made a progress, partly of a spiritual, partly of a secular character, into the South. He held a synod at Melfi; the extirpation of concubinage, universal among

the Neapolitan clergy, was the pretext;¹ the Norman treaty the real object. The Normans wanted a more imposing title than that of conquest to their Italian possessions. They were not disposed to question the right of one, who was on his part disposed to make such title on his own authority. The Pope wanted the Norman aid; he scrupled not to advance the enormous pretension of a seignorial suzerainty over the whole kingdom of Naples, how devolved and how obtained, or on what ground, no one ever presumed or cared to inquire, and no one as yet has been able to answer, though few for centuries could safely dispute. He invested the Norman Richard in the principality of Capua; Robert Guiscard in the Dukedom of Apulia, of Calabria, and of Sicily, which he was to recover from the Saracens.

The Sovereign was not long in putting his feudatories to the test of their fidelity. The Pope returned to Rome, followed by his new Prætorian guards. Their first duty, which they undertook with fierce delight, was the extermination, or at least the humiliation of

¹ "Hic ecclesiastica propter
Ad partes illas tractanda negotia venit.
Namque sacerdotes, Levitæ, clericus omnis
Hâc regione palam se conjugio sociabant.
Concilium celebrans ibi Papa faventibus illi
Præsulibus centum jus ad synodale vocatis,
Ferre sacerdotes monet altarisque ministros
Arma pudicitia: vocat hos et præcipit esse
Ecclesie sponso, quia non est jure sacerdos
Luxurie cultor; sic extirpavit ab illis
Partibus uxores omnino Presbyterorum
Spretore minitans anathemate percutiendos."

Gul. App., lib. ii. ; *Muratori*, v. 202.

The clergy of the kingdom of Naples, like that of the rest of Italy, were to a great extent married: they were Greeks in this usage, as in subjection to the empire; but Nicolas and the Normans were leagued to extirpate all Greek influences.

those ruthless nobles who had so long ruled over Rome. They trampled on the pride of the Counts of Tusculum, Præneste, and Nomentana,¹ who looked out from their inaccessible castles to see their territories wasted with fire and sword ; and were even driven to go to Rome and make their peace with the Pope. The Normans crossed the Tiber, attacked the Count of Galeria, whose castle commanded the road to Rome, and who plundered all the pilgrims on their way. This ruffian had been vainly anathematized by each succeeding Pope, the last time in full synod by Nicolas himself, for robbing an English archbishop (Stigand of Canterbury) and an English Count of 1000 pounds.² This castle and others as far as Sutri, they demolished or subdued.

The proceedings of Nicolas II., this absolute Italianization of the Pope, this close alliance with the only race who could confront the military prowess of the Germans, were watched with the utmost jealousy by the Imperialists in Italy, and by the whole of Germany. At Florence Nicolas felt the approach of death ; he began to take measures for the appointment of his successor. It was his manifest aim absolutely to exclude the Germans from all hope, from all concern in this splendid inheritance. Already the great German prelates had observed, that all which the Lateran Council had left to the Emperor had been the supercilious notification by the Cardinals of the appointment to the Papacy, or if this statute might bear a stronger inter-

¹ " Nam non solum Tusculanorum, et Prænestinorum et Nomentanorum superbiam calcaverunt, sed et Romam transeuntes, Galeriam et omnia castra Comitum Gerardi, usque Sutrium vastaverunt, quæ res Romanam urbem Capitaneorum liberavit dominatione." — Bonizo, p. 806.

² *Money of Paria*, says the Disceptatio Synodalis, p. 1169.

pretation, Pope Nicolas is said to have issued a second decree almost annulling the consent of the Emperor. Hanno of Cologne, who had already been involved in some dispute with Pope Nicolas, with the consent of the other great prelates of Germany, took up the cause of July 27, 1061. the Emperor, which was now that of the Transalpine Church; he sent letters of excommunication, of deposition from the Papal throne to the dying Nicolas. Nicolas is said to have read them with deep affliction, and immediately to have expired.¹

The Cardinals on the death of Nicolas still held together, yet they did not venture at once to act upon the Lateran decrees or that of the deceased Pope. They feared, or were too prudent to defy the whole German interest. The Counts of Tusculum and the other barons, in revenge for their humiliation, threw themselves headlong into the Imperial faction. They sent the golden crown and the other insignia of the Patriarchate to the young Henry, and urged him to nominate a Pope, not a Roman. It might be seen at once at whom was pointed their sentence of exclusion. The Cardinals likewise sent a Legate, the Cardinal Stephen, to the youthful King and to his mother. This Cardi-

¹ "Ad vindicandam vero suam aliorumque injuriam erexit se animo Coloniensis. . . . Communi consensu orthodoxorum episcoporum, direxit illis (the Pope and the Cardinals) excommunicationis epistolam, quâ visâ et dolens, et gemens præsentem (the Pope) deseruit vitam." This passage of Benzo (lib. vii. p. 397) is partly confirmed by a passage from Anselm of Lucca (or Cardinal Deusdedit), who asserts that the Emperor and the Germans had made themselves unworthy even of this scanty mark of respect, the notification of the appointment of the Pope: *Primum quia postea Nicolaum Coloniensem Archiepiscopum pro suis excessibus corripuisse graviter tulerunt, cumque hujus gratiâ, quantum in se erat, a Papatu deposuerunt, et nomen ejusdem in canone consecrationis nominari vetuerunt.* Ap. Canis. Antiq. Lect. vi. p. 221. Compare Höfler, p. 358.

nal was not admitted, probably as representing a body who were usurping the rights of the Empire.

Hildebrand knew that his time was not yet come ; and of all the great qualifications of this lofty Churchman, nothing is more extraordinary than his suppression of his personal ambition, the patience with which he was content to work in a subordinate station, to be the first in influence without being the first in worldly dignity. Nor was there any other ecclesiastic in the Church of Rome whom he dared or chose to advance. The vacancy continued for three months, even before the initiatory nomination of the Cardinals took place. At length they chose a Lombard, Anselm of Badagio, Bishop of Lucca ; but a Lombard with peculiar claims and marked opinions, who brought with him a strong and now triumphant party in Northern Italy ; who was the sworn and tried enemy of doctrines odious to a large part, especially odious to the whole monastic section of the Church. Anselm had at one time been proposed as Archbishop of Milan : had he obtained that rank, the feud which was kept alive by the weakness, the connivance, if not the inclination of that great prelate towards the married clergy, had come to an earlier issue.

The Archbishop of Milan was the most powerful prince, when there was not an Italian Emperor or King of Italy, in the north of the Peninsula. The power of the Archbishop, and the use which he could make of this power, cannot be estimated without ascending to the beginning of this century, and even higher than the archiepiscopate of Heribert. Milan owes almost all her glory to her Archbishops. The first restorer of her greatness was Archbishop Anspert. ^{Anspert archbishop, 868 ; died 881.} Milan, which had ranked among the nine great cities

of the Empire, whose wonders had been commemorated in the poetical panegyric of Ausonius,¹ had never recovered its utter ruin by Attila. Pavia, under the Ostrogoths and Lombards, was the capital of Northern Italy. The great Archbishop Anspert (during the reign of Charles the Fat) first assumed his metropolitan dignity over his suffragans of Cremona and Bergamo, haughtily neglected the citations of the Pope; and when John VIII. commanded the clergy of Milan to proceed to a new election in place of the contumacious prelate, the clergy paid no regard whatever to the mandate. Anspert was a magnificent as well as powerful prelate; he built the porch of San Ambrogio. Heribert, who now stands before us, was the second founder of Milan's greatness. The Archbishop Otto of Visconti (in later times) was the first Lord of Milan, and handed down the ducal dominion (a more dubious title to the gratitude of Milan!) to the house of Visconti.² The prelate-prince Heribert was magnificent in his charities and uncompromising in his assertion of his episcopal rights. During a long famine, more or less severe, of twenty years, his prodigality to the poor was unexhausted; at the same time he seized with a strong hand all the property of the Church which had been wasted or alienated by the rapacity or weakness of his predecessors. He was esteemed a great divine, but not less a master in worldly policy.³ One of his first acts was to cross the Alps,⁴ and of his sole authority to elect Conrad the Salic King of Italy. According to the right

Archbishop
Heribert,
1018.

¹ "Et Mediolani mira omnia." The verses are worth reading. — Auson.

² Landulph. Sen. ii.

³ "Divinâ pollens scientiâ, sæcularique ingenio astutus."

⁴ Verri, Storia di Milano, c. ii. p. 87.

asserted by the Archbishop of Milan to crown the King of Italy (that of crowning the Emperor belonged to the Pope) Conrad received the famous iron crown from the hand of Heribert;¹ and at the diet of Roncaglia, Italy recognized the sovereign thus chosen by the Archbishop of Milan.² When Conrad went to Rome to receive the Imperial crown, there A.D. 1026. broke out one of the fierce quarrels for precedence between the Archbishops of Milan and Ravenna. It was suspended for a time by the Pope's authority, but followed by a war in which the two martial prelates of the same name headed their own forces. Heribert of Ravenna escaped with difficulty within the walls of his city. Among the rewards for his service the Emperor Conrad had bestowed on the Archbishops of Milan the right to appoint, or at least to grant the investiture of the See of Lodi. On the death of the bishop, Heribert hastened to supply the place with a faithful partisan. The clergy and people of Lodi resented this invasion of their rights, and proceeded to another election. Heribert instantly marched upon Lodi; after a vigorous resistance he compelled the city to receive his bishop, and from this cause sprang the implacable hatred between Milan and Lodi.³ The martial prelate, also in obedience to the summons of his liege lord, crossed the Alps, and aided Conrad in the conquest of Burgundy. But his own warlike nobles began to

¹ Arnulfus, *Rer. Ital. Script.*, ix. 14; Wippo, *Vit. Conrad.*

² "Nel corso di ventisette anni ch' egli occupò questa sede, Milano diventò la città precipua della Lombardia." — Verri, p. 124.

³ "Ab illo etenim tempore inter Mediolanenses et Laudenses implacabile viguit odium." The Milanese were the more powerful and wealthy: those of Lodi valiant to ferocity (truces). They cared not for loss, if they could inflict loss on their enemies. — Arnulf, ii. c. vii.

rebel against the tyranny of Heribert. The important law of Conrad, passed at the Diet of Roncaglia, had wrought a revolution in the feudal system; it recognized the hereditary descent of fiefs hitherto, nominally at least, held at the will of the suzerain. Heribert refused to admit the valvassors of the Church of Milan to this privilege; he seized on a vacant fief, and thus embodied against him all the great beneficiaries. They broke out in open rebellion.¹ Heribert attempted to allay the mutiny by prudent measures; he then had recourse to force. With the assistance, no doubt, of the people, to whom the tyrannous nobles were odious, he drove them out of the city. They left it in sorrow.² There, however, they were joined by the lords of the surrounding castles and by the people of Lodi, burning for revenge against Heribert. A great battle took place at Campo Malo; the Bishop of Asti, on Heribert's side, was slain. Heribert, confounded by many desertions, retired into the city, and summoned the Emperor to his aid.³

Conrad crossed the Alps, but instead of espousing the
A.D. 1037. cause of the Archbishop, offended by the freedom of the populace, he retired to hold his court at Pavia. There, at a great diet, he sat as suzerain, to grant redress to all appellants to his tribunal. A charge was brought against the Archbishop of Milan; it was seconded by clamorous outcries from his enemies. The Emperor commanded the arrest of the Archbishop of Milan, and his partisans the Bishops of Vercelli, Piacenza, and Cremona. The intelligence was received

¹ This, I think, is clear from Arnulf; "*Compertâ autem occasione cujusdam beneficio privati, subito proruunt.*" — Ibid.

² "*Ab urbe discedunt mœrentes.*" — Ibid.

³ Arnulf, ii.; Landulf, ii. 22.

with profound sorrow and indignation at Milan. The clergy chanted solemn litanies for his deliverance, the people rushed to arms. Heribert contrived to escape from his drunken German guards, and threw himself into the city, where he was received with universal joy. The Emperor speedily laid siege to Milan; the Archbishop made a gallant defence, and Conrad retired discomfited. In revenge he declared Heribert deposed, and appointed a rival prelate. The dauntless Heribert retaliated by secretly endeavoring to set up a rival King of Italy. Insulted and baffled, after having ravaged the whole country in his impotent wrath, the mighty Emperor Conrad retired beyond the Alps.¹ The triumphant Heribert wreaked his ^{Aug.} ^{A.D. 1038.} vengeance on the adherents of the rival prelate, punishing them in person and in property.

Thus the conqueror at once of his own rebellious liegemen and of the Emperor himself, the Archbishop ruled his splendid city, which he seemed determined to arm against any future aggressions upon its liberties.² It was at this time that the Christian bishop invented the carroccio, the car-borne standard of Milan, afterwards adopted by the other Italian cities. In the great car rose a tall mast with a transverse beam, supporting a banner, on which above were the arms of the city, below the crucified Saviour, visible to the whole army, to animate or console the combatants in success or defeat. The elevation of this banner was the summons

¹ Conrad, who had proceeded to the south of Italy, obtained the excommunication of the Archbishop of Milan from Pope Benedict XI. Heribert paid no more respect to the excommunication of the Pope than to the ban of the empire. Conrad died the year after, June 4, A.D. 1039.

² Landulph is throughout the wondering panegyrist of Heribert.

which all Milan was to obey, the peasant and the noble, the rich and the poor.¹

Milan, but for her internal dissensions, now relieved by the death of Conrad from her one formidable enemy, might have enjoyed long prosperity. For a time Heribert overawed both nobles and people. But other feuds began. The new military captains trained by Heribert in his wars had proved more intolerable tyrants than the old nobles, whom the people began to regret, and to call the guardians and protectors rather than the oppressors of the people.² Yet we find the whole nobility soon united in a common cause. Lanzo, one of the nobles, espoused the popular faction. The valvasors and the populace met in bloody strife in every quarter of the city. Again the worsted nobles were forced to leave the city; again the country chieftains made common cause with them. Six fortresses were built to bar every access to the city; for three years Milan was in a state of siege.³ But the skill and courage of Lanzo baffled all assault. The city suffered greatly from famine. A small domain under the walls produced some corn and wine. On both sides the prisoners were treated with the utmost inhumanity. The part which Heribert took in this conflict is not clear. By some he is represented as having left the city with the expelled nobles. His panegyrist ascribes to him a stately neutrality.⁴ Though connected with them by birth, he rebuked, with vain but earnest severity, the

¹ Compare Verri, p. 133; Muratori, *Dissert.*; Arnulf, ii. 16.

² Landulph panegyricizes the ancient "Duces."

³ The beginning of this feud was A.D. 1051 or 1052.

⁴ "Qualiter nec fuit cum populo, nec voluntati majorum juit." — Landulph.

avarice and licentiousness of the nobles, yet would not commit himself to the popular cause.

Lanzo at length found his way to the Court of Henry, the son and successor of the Emperor Conrad. But Henry suspected the fickleness of the Italians; he dreaded the enmity of Heribert, so fatal to his father. He imposed the hard terms, that four thousand of his cavalry should be admitted within the city, and that Lanzo should be answerable for the fidelity of the citizens. Lanzo was a man of inexhaustible resources. With patriotic treachery he revealed his own secret negotiations with the Emperor, and used these haughty demands as an argument to force the conflicting parties to peace. He urged on the nobles and people that their quarrels would only yield them up to the remorseless tyranny of the barbarous Germans. The nobles reëntered the city; peace was restored.

Soon after this Heribert died. The Archbishop consoled his weeping attendants on his deathbed — “I am going to the feet of St. Ambrose.” He received the Sacrament in the presence of the whole clergy of Milan; and this martial and secular prelate was, if not directly canonized by the admiration of his countrymen, yet admitted to equal veneration with the holiest and most world-despising saints. His miracles were soon recorded in the chronicles of the city. The worthy successor of St. Ambrose was reported to have averted famine from the land by his prayers. The pastoral staff of Ambrose, having been stolen by a sacrilegious robber for the sake of its precious metal, revealed itself to his successor.

Who was to fill the throne of the mighty and sainted Heribert? Among the names proposed was that of

Anselm of Badagio, afterwards Bishop of Lucca, and Pope under the name of Alexander II.¹ The choice fell upon Guido, a man of far inferior character and determination than his predecessor,² whose warlike example he seemed at first disposed to follow, he headed the troops of Milan in a war with Pavia; he asserted at Rome the precedence of the Milanese see against rival Ravenna. But Guido was unequal to the imminent crisis, more important to the Church and to Christianity than all the disputes between the nobles, valvassors, and people, when the clergy of Milan dared to assert their real or supposed privileges against all the power of Rome, against the reviving austerity of monasticism, and against the populace of Milan. It involved the great question of the marriage of the priesthood, of which the Milanese clergy were the avowed champions. It was a protest, or rather a direct rebellion against the vast scheme of ecclesiastical dominion already matured, at least in the mind of Hildebrand; and which could never have been accomplished but by a celebrate clergy. Anselm of Badagio, an avowed monk, a monk of monks, as Archbishop of Milan, would have taken a decided part; Guido, by his vacillation, incurred the contempt of both parties, inflaming the feud by his unsettled policy, and betraying, from want of courage to support it, that cause to which no doubt he had a secret leaning.

The Church of Milan revered the memory of St. S. Ambrose. Ambrose almost as proudly as Rome that of

¹ The four candidates were presented to the Emperor Henry. Guido was not a noble. — Giuliani, iii. p. 422.

² “Vi volle tutta l’astuzia di Guido, tutto il timore, che si aveva del re Enrico e multo denaro, per ottenere, che fosse consecrato il nuovo archivescovo.” — Verri, p. 136.

St. Peter. Milan boasted the most numerous, best appointed and best organized clergy. According to a proverb of the time, Milan was to be admired for its clergy, Pavia for its pleasures, Rome for its buildings, Ravenna for its churches.¹ It had its peculiar service, the Ambrosian, which had been respected, and was undisturbed by Gregory the Great.

But the Church of Milan possessed likewise — or boasted that it possessed — an unbroken tradition from St. Ambrose himself. They cited boldly, publicly, and without any charge that they had falsified the text — the very words of St. Ambrose, authorizing, if not the marriage of the clergy, the Greek usage, that priests married before their ordination should retain their wives.² Heribert

Church of
Milan asserts
right of
marriage.

¹ “Ecclesia enim Ambrosiana Domino annuente, sapientibus sacerdotibus, Levitis et Subdiaconibus, super ceteras abundabat ecclesias. Unde in proverbium dictum est, Mediolanum in clericis, Pavia in deliciis, Roma in ædificiis, Ravenna in ecclesiis.” — Landulph, Sen. iii. p. 96. Damiani himself praises highly the clergy of Turin (allied with Milan) as in all other respects virtuous, learned. “They chanted like angels; they seemed a noble ecclesiastical senate.” When he found them married, all their virtues disappeared. — Opuscul. xviii.

² This was the sentence: “De *monogamiâ* sacerdotum quid loquar? quum una tantum permittitur copula et non repetita, et hæc lex est non iterare conjugium.” This text now stands: “De *castimoniâ* autem quid loquar, quando una tantum nec repetita permittitur copula? Et in ipso ergo conjugio lex est non iterare conjugium.” — S. Ambros. Oper. edit. St. Maur. ii. 66, Paris, 1686. Another passage was triumphantly cited in a public speech (Rer. Ital. Script. iv. p. 109): “Virtutum autem magister apostolus est . . . qui unius uxoris virum præcipit esse, non quod exortem excludat conjugii, nam hoc supra legem præcepti est, sed ut conjugali castimoniâ fruatur absolutionis sui gratiâ: *nulla enim culpa est conjugii, sed lex*. Ideo apostolus legem posuit dicens; si quis sine crimine est, unius uxoris vir, tenetur ad legem *sacerdotii supradicti* (am?) qui autem iteraverit conjugium, culpam quidem non habet coinquinati, sed prærogativâ exiit sacerdotis.” In the editions this now stands: “Ut conjugali castimoniâ servet absolutionis sui gratiam.” Instead of the words in italics, omitted: “Neque iterum ut filios in sacerdotio creare apostolica invitetur auctoritate, habentem enim dixit filios non facientem, neque conjugium iterare.” Then:

himself, the great Archbishop, was a married man ; his wedlock had neither diminished his power nor barred his canonization.¹ In assertion of this privilege they dauntlessly defied all superior authority, denied as to this, as to their other precious rights, all supremacy of the Pope. Nor was it a privilege of which they availed themselves sparingly. By the accounts of friends and foes, the practice of marriage was all but universal among the Lombard clergy. They were publicly, legally, married with ring and dowry,² as were the laity of Milan ; and

"Ideo apostolus legem posuit dicens, si quis sine crimine est unius uxoris vir, tenetur ad legem sacerdotii suscipiendi," *et seqq.*

At the revival of letters there were great disputes about the falsification of the texts of the Fathers. See Koster's Preface to Edit. Basil. 1555; Francis Junius, Præfat. ad Indic. Expurgat.; Rivet, Critica Sacra, iii. 6; Daillé: on the other side, the Benedictine Editors and Puricelli, apud Muratori, R. It. Scrip.; and the Preface of Cardinal Montalto to the Roman edition. Sound and impartial criticism would, in my judgment, unquestionably maintain the older reading. Yet forgeries were clearly not all on one side. Galvaneo Fiamma quotes from an ancient chronicle of Dazio the account of a synod held at Constantinople (an apocryphal synod), in which Ambrose was present! in which one party asserted that married priests could not be saved. The supreme pontiff (Damasus!) submitted the question to S. Ambrose. He replied: "Perfectio vitæ non in castitate, sed in charitate consistit, secundum illud Apostoli, si linguis hominum loquor et angelorum, etc. Ideo lex concedit sacerdotes semel virginem uxorem ducere, sed conjugium non iterare. Si autem mortuâ primâ uxore sacerdos aliam duxerit, sacerdotium amittat." Peter Azerid wrote thus at the beginning of the fourteenth century: "Iis omnino benedicens B. Ambrosius, unâ uxore uti posse concessit, quâ defunctâ, et ipsi vidui in æternum permaneant. Quæ consuetudo duravit annis septuaginta usque ad tempora Alexandri Papæ, quem civitas Mediolanensis genuerat." In the older editions of Corio (mine is Venezia, 1554) is a passage which was struck out in the later editions: "Concesse loro (S. Ambrogio) ch'è potessero havere moglie vergine, la qual morendo, restassero poi vedove, si come chiaramente si legge nella prima al Timoteo." — p. 56. Puricelli in Muratori, H. I. S. iv. 122.

¹ "Hic Archiepiscopus habuit uxorem nobilem mulierem: quæ donavit dotem suam monasterio Sancti Dionysii, quæ usque hodiè Uxeria dicitur." — Galvaneus Fiamma, *sub ann.* 1040.

² "Cuncti enim cum publicis uxoribus sive scortis suam ignominiose du-

this, which was elsewhere esteemed a vice, became in Milan, by their bold assertion of its lawfulness, a heresy.¹

Still there were many of the austerer clergy in Milan, as in other parts of Italy, who looked with what they esteemed righteous indignation at this licentious and sensual privilege. Three persons bound themselves in a holy league of enmity against the married clergy: of these Anselm of Badagio was one; the second, Ariald, a man of humble birth, and therefore more able to speak to the hearts of the rude populace; the third, Landulph, a noble, remarkable for his eloquence. Landulph and Ariald began to preach in Milan to the populace of the city, and to the peasantry, the unlawfulness and licentiousness of a married clergy.² Each party strove to implicate the other with the name of an odious heresy; the monastics branded the asserters of clerical marriage with the old name proverbial for sensuality, Nicolaitans: the Lombard Clergy affected to treat their adversaries as Paterines or Manicheans. This was no unmeaning phrase. During the rule of Heribert, one of those strange sects, with many old Gnostic opinions,

cebant vitam." — Vit. B. Arial di, a B. Andreâ, Bolland, xxvii. Jun. In the first sermon of Ariald, he says of the clergy: "Et ipsi, ut cernitis, sicut laici palam uxores ducunt." He adds; "Stuprum quemadmodum scelesti laici sequuntur." — Ibid. He speaks of their greater vigor as not laboring but living "ex dono Dei."

¹ "Vitium quippe in hæresin vertitur, cum perversi dogmatis assertione firmatur." See the furious invective of Damiani "contra clericos intemperantes," c. vii. "Nec vos terreat — (he is urging the pellices, as he calls them, to break off their connexions) — quod forte, non dicam fidei, sed perfidiæ vos annulus subarrhavit; quod rata et monimenta dotalia notarius quasi matrimonii jure conscripsit; quod juramentum ad confirmandam quodammodo conjugii copulum utrinque processit. Ignorantes quia pro uniuscujusque fugaci voluptate concubitus mille annorum negotiantur incendium." — Ibid. c. iii.

² The Council of Pavia, under Benedict VIII. (A.C. 1021), with the approbation of the emperor, Henry II., had passed an ordinance to enforce the celibacy of the clergy.

had appeared at Monteforte. A certain Gerard was at their head: their doctrines contained much of mystic Gnosticism. They identified the Saviour with the soul of man born into a corruptible state.¹ The Holy Ghost was apparently the divine Intelligence (*Nous*) revealing itself to man. They were severe ascetics, condemned all union of the sexes, and said that if men would abstain from corruption, they would generate like bees, without conjunction. They denied the absolving power of the priesthood, that they ascribed to an unseen influence which visited God's people. Their great tenet was that it was right to die in torments, so to purify the soul; they rejoiced therefore in martyrdom: if not so happy as to meet it before the approach of death, they were released by one of their own people. Heribert gratified their passion for martyrdom; he burned all, except a few, who shrunk from death, on an immense pyre in Milan.² The married clergy taunted their opponents with the name and tenets of this hated sect; they even lodged a formal accusation against them before the archbishop. Guido attempted to silence both parties by gentle admonitions, but without effect; at length the conflict broke out.

During a great festival, for the translation of the reliques of the martyr Nazarius, a priest was maddened by the unmeasured invectives of Ariald against his married brethren. Ariald had driven the singers and all the clergy out of the choir of the church; he caused a paper to be written, which bound all the clergy under an oath to maintain their chastity; he endeavored to compel all ecclesiastics to sign this paper.³ The priest

¹ Rodolphus Glaber, iv. 2; Landulph, Sen.

² Landulph, apud Muratori.

³ Arnulf.

broke out into a violent harangue, and struck Ariald. This was the signal for a general tumult ; the adherents of Ariald rushed through the streets, the bells rang, the populace gathered from all quarters. The populace are usually on the side of those who make the most austere show of religion ; they were jealous of the wealth of the clergy : many of them, like the plebeians of Rome, were burdened with heavy debts, severely exacted no doubt by the clergy.¹ The higher ecclesiastics were mostly patrician in birth, and habits, and faction. Everywhere they were insulted, assaulted, beaten, their houses plundered ; and they were forced by a summary process of divorce to abandon their wives.² The nobles were overawed and dared not interpose. Nor were the clergy of the city alone exposed to this popular persecution. The preachers roved through the country and stirred up the peasantry against the priests and their concubines, — they would give them no more respectful name.

Ariald and Landulph went to Rome, to obtain the sanction of the Pope, Stephen IX., for their proceedings. The Cardinal Dionysius, a Milanese by Dec. 9, 1057. birth, attempted a cautious and timid opposition ; he did not venture, except slightly and incidentally, to enter on the grave question of the marriage of the clergy ; but remonstrated against the violence of their adversaries, the stirring up the rabble with clubs, and spears, and swords, against the holy anointed priesthood. A Legation was appointed by Pope Stephen, consisting of

¹ "Horum disseminatis verbis pestilenter, subito multi quibus alienum æs purissime exigebatur, quosque foris et intus dura paupertas agebat," etc. — Landulph, vi. 9.

² "Postea vero summo cum dedecore mulierum divortium sine lege, sine jure, sine Episcopo, non Deum, sed pecuniam illorum amantes, gladiis et fustibus feriebant." — Ibid.

Ariald, Anselm of Lucca, and Hildebrand. This first mission had no effect in allaying the strife; the dissension was growing fast into a civil war.¹

Guido at length took courage, and assembling a synod
A.D. 1058. at Novara, or rather at Fontaneto, in the territory of Novara, asserted his full archiepiscopal authority,² and excommunicated the turbulent Ariald, Landulph, and their partisans; they treated the excommunication with contempt. Another Legation arrived, with the famous Peter Damiani, now compelled to be a cardinal, who, with Anselm of Lucca, was commissioned by the new Pope, Nicolas, to investigate the spiritual state of Milan. Peter Damiani was the austere monk in Italy, a monk who, compelled to be a bishop, had striven with all his might to throw off the worldly and unholy burden. His horror at sexual indulgence was almost a madness.³ Yet the Cardinal and his
A.D. 1059. colleagues were received with all outward show of respect by the Archbishop and the clergy; but the pride of the Milanese of all ranks was in secret skilfully excited; would they permit the church of St. Ambrose to be enslaved by that of Rome? The popular indig-

¹ This first legation is distinctly asserted by Landulph; it is barely possible that it may be another version of the later one.

² "Ut quodammodo Ecclesia Mediolanensis suis jussibus obtemperaret."

³ "Interea et vos alloquor, o lepores clericorum, pulpamenta diaboli, projectio Paradisi, virus mentium, gladii animarum, aconita bibentium, toxica convivarum, materia peccandi, occasio pereundi. Vos, inquam, alloquor, gynecæa hostis antiqui, vos upupæ, ululæ, noctuæ, lupæ, sanguisugæ, affer, affer sine cessatione dicentes. Venite itaque audite me, scorta, prostibula, savia, volutabra porcorum pinguium, cubilia spirituum immundorum, nymphæ, sirenæ, lamia, *dianæ*, quæ? . . . vos tigrides impiæ . . . vos harpyæ, vos sirenæ atque charybides . . . vos viperæ furiosæ," — and so on for paragraphs. These are the terms in which he addresses the wives of the clergy. Damiani must be read to understand his sacred horror of priestly wedlock.

nation was further roused by the appearance of the Legate with Anselm of Lucca on his right hand, and the archbishop of Milan on his left. Milan assembled at the ringing of the bells in all the churches, and the summons of an enormous brazen trumpet, which shrieked through the streets. The fickle populace were now as furious in defence of the clergy, who seemed the champions of the liberties of the city, as they had been in their persecution. The cry was loud that the church of S. Ambrose would never submit to the Roman pontiff. The life of Damiani was in danger;¹ but Damiani was not a man to quail before popular tumult; he mounted the pulpit; he asserted with firm and argumentative tone the supreme jurisdiction of Rome;² he boldly appealed to their own archives to prove that Ambrose himself had applied to the Pope Siricius, and that the Pope had sent his legates, a priest, a deacon, and a subdeacon, to assist Ambrose in rooting out from his city that same Nicolaitan heresy, the marriage of the clergy, for which they now asserted the authority of Ambrose.³ Guido was grown older and more timid; the people saw him seated of his own ac-

¹ "Intentabant mihi, ut ita loquor, omnem mentem, et, ut ab amicis meis sæpe suggestum est, nonnulli meum sanguinem sitiiebant." — Damian. Op. v.

² Damiani (ad Card. Hildebrand) describes the sensitive pride of the Milanese as to the Church of St. Ambrose: "Factione clericorum repente in populo murmur exoritur non debere Ambrosianam ecclesiam Romanis legibus subicere, nullumque judicandi vel disponendi jus Romano pontifici in illâ sede competere. Nimis indignum, inquit, ut quæ sub progenitoribus nostris semper fuit libera ad nostræ confusionis opprobrium nunc alteri, quod absit, ecclesiæ sit subjecta!"

³ Damiani probably believed this dauntless assertion. Siricius was certainly the first Pope who authoritatively condemned the marriage of the clergy; but imagine Ambrose needing or demanding aid from the Pope to exterminate this heresy in his own diocese!

cord on a stool at the feet of Damiani. The clergy, deserted by the bishops, deserted again by the populace, who were overawed by the eloquence and lofty bearing of the cardinal, had no resource but humble submission.¹ The Archbishop, reluctantly, it is said, took a solemn oath against simony, and against the marriage of priests. The clergy were compelled to subscribe the humiliating concession ; every simoniac (and of simony every clergyman of Milan, from the Archbishop downwards, was accused) was to submit to a penance of five or seven years in proportion to his guilt ; but there were those who felt the pride of Milan humbled, Damiani's assuming precedence over the archbishop goaded them to frenzy. "O senseless Milanese ! (writes the indignant historian, who represents the feelings of this party) who has fascinated you ? Yesterday you clamored for the independent supremacy of your see, to-day you submit to this base subjection. If Rome is to be honored for the apostle, Milan is not to be despised, who boasts her Ambrose." ²

At the great Council, however, at Rome (1059), which assigned the election of the Popes to the cardinals, Guido sat, as archbishop of Milan, at the right hand of the Pope, a reward for his submission. He was attended by his suffragans, the Bishops of Brescia, Turin, Asti, Novara, Lodi, Vercelli. Ariald assailed Guido, as a favorer of simony and of concubinage ; he was defended by his suffragans ; the temper of Nicolas allayed the strife. Guido perhaps hence was again

¹ Damiani's letter to Guido, humbly thanking him for the gift of two stoles, contrasts singularly with his demeanor and influence in the city.—*Epist.* iii. 7.

² Arnulph. Compare Tristano Calchi, *Hist. Patr.* vi. 132.

supposed to espouse the cause of the married clergy ; he rose, therefore, with them into high popularity. Though the Council denounced both simony and concubinage in severe statutes, the Lombard bishops dared not publish them in their cities. Adrian of Brescia alone ventured to do this : he hardly escaped being torn to pieces by the rabble. In Cremona and Piacenza the people split into two parties — those who adhered to, and those who refused communion with the married clergy.¹

Anselm of Badagio, Bishop of Lucca, the instigator of Landulph and of Ariald, was now summoned to a loftier station : on him had fallen the choice of the cardinals assembled at Rome. But the election of Alexander II. (such was his title) without the consent of the Emperor, was received as a bold invasion of the Imperial rights by the Transalpine prelates. The Lombard ecclesiastics, especially those who were for the marriage of the clergy, dreaded the elevation of Alexander, whom they hated with personal hatred, and foresaw no doubt the overweening influence of Hildebrand and of the high monastic party. They too would have an Italian Pope, but a Pope from their part of Italy.²

Guibert was the Chancellor of the Empire, the administrator of the Imperial interests in Italy. By his

¹ “ Concilio igitur rite celebrato episcopi Longobardi donum rementes, cum magnas *Levitis concubinariis et sacerdotibus acceperissent pecunias* [Bonizo was on the other side] decreta Patrum celaverunt prætur unum scilicet Brixienarium Episcopum qui veniens Brixiam, cum decreta Papæ publice recitasset, a clericis verberatus pæne occisus est, quod factum non medioere Pateriæ dedit incrementum. Nam non solum Brixie, sed et Cremonæ et Placentiæ et per omnes alias provincias multi concubinatorum abstinebant communione.” — Bonizo, p. 807.

² “ Nec aliunde se habere Papam, nisi ex Paradiso Italiæ, talemque qui scivit compati infirmitatibus eorum.” — Bonizo, p. 80.

advice a Council was assembled in Basle, composed of German and Lombard prelates. The Council annulled the election of Alexander, and chose Cadalous, Bishop of Parma, who took the name of Honorius II.¹ The Roman people were represented at Basle by the Count of Galeria, and some of the other barons who had been put down by the Normans. The passions of the time can be best known by the language of the time. It would be unjust to estimate the character of Cadalous by the frantic words of Damiani; but they show clearly the fanaticism of hatred with which his appointment was viewed by the adverse party. He is described as the preacher of the devil, the enemy of man's salvation, the apostle of Antichrist, the gulf of lewdness, the filth of mankind, the sink of all vices, the abomination of heaven, food for hell fire.² After these and many other equally opprobrious terms, it is nothing to accuse him of the most deplorable ignorance.³ Unfortunately Dami-

¹ Compare throughout the *Disceptatio Synodalis* between the advocate of the Emperor and the Defender of the Roman Church before the Council of Augsburg, remembering that it was the work of Peter Damiani. I had written Osbor after the authorities. The Germans, as I am informed by M. Ranke, know no such place: they read Augsburg. [1857.]

² "Cadalous videlicet perturbator ecclesiæ, eversor Apostolicæ disciplinæ, inimicus salutis humanæ . . . radix peccati, præco Diaboli, apostolus Antichristi; et quid plura dicam? sagitta producta de pharetrâ Satanæ, virga Assur, filius Belial, filius perditionis, qui adversatur et extollitur supra omne quod dicitur Deus, aut quod colitur: vorago libidinis, naufragium castitatis, Christianitatis opprobrium, ignominia sacerdotum, genimen viperarum, fœtor orbis, spurcitia sæculi, dedecus universitatis . . . serpens lubricus, coluber tortuosus, stercus hominum, latrina criminum, sentina vitiorum, abominatio coeli, projectio paradisi, pabulum Tartari, stipula ignis æterni." — Damiani, *Epist.* vii. 3. The whole epistle is to obtain the interposition of the youthful Emperor.

³ Damiani, writing to the Archbishop of Ravenna, who seems to have doubted which side to take, represents Cadalous as without character or learning: "Ita est homo stolidus et nullius ingenii ut credi possit nesciisse per se tallia machinari." — If he can explain a single verse, I will not say

ani assumed the language of a prophet, and foretold that the impious usurper would not live a year from the period of his elevation! ¹ At the election of Cadalous, writes another hostile historian, the Simoniacs rejoiced, the priests who had concubines exulted with loud joy.² His partisans declared that all the Catholic Bishops of Italy, Germany, and Burgundy, approved his elevation.³

The election of Alexander had taken place on the 1st of October, that of Honorius II. on the feast of St. Simon and St. Jude (Oct 28). Open war must decide the contest for the vicegerency of the Prince of Peace. It was a war of Germany and the antimonastic part of the clergy in Lombardy and other parts of Italy on one side, against the Hildebrandism of Rome and the monasticism of Christendom aided by the arms of the Normans. Winter alone suspended the hostile operations; the passes of the Alps were closed. With the spring, Cadalous descended upon Italy; he was received with joyful acclamations, as the champion of their cause, by the Lombard prelates. But while he advanced, an unarmed conflict was taking place in Rome. Neither Pope nor Antipope was the most prominent man of his party. On the side of Cadalous (the Chancellor Guibert stood more aloof) was Benzo, Bishop of Albi, a faithful adherent of the Empire, but

of a psalm, but of a homily, I will at once submit to him, and own him not merely the successor of the Apostle, but an Apostle.

¹ "Fumea vita volat, mors improvisa propinquat,
Imminet expleti præpes tibi terminus anni;
Non ego te fallo: cepto morieris in anno."

Epist. i. 20.

² "Tunc symoniaci lætabantur, concubinati vero sacerdotes ingenti exultabant tripudio." — Bonizo, p. 807.

³ "Collaudantibus Italiæ, Alemanniæ, Burgundiæ Catholicis Episcopis." — Benzo, c. iv.

a man of Italian subtlety, utterly unscrupulous, and of ready and popular eloquence, with that coarse saturnalian humor which pleases the Italian, especially the Roman ear.¹ Benzo appeared, and was received in Rome as the ambassador of the Emperor. He was lodged in the Octavian palace. During a whole week he was permitted to address the people day after day. Those whom he could not persuade with his eloquence he bribed with money, for from the private wealth of Cadalous, which was large, and other sources, he was richly provided with means of working on the Roman nobles and people.² In his harangues, he treated Alexander with the bitterest contempt, and openly strove to alienate the people from him; to Hildebrand he paid the homage of his most furious invective. Neither the Pope nor Hildebrand ventured to disturb this avowed emissary of Cadalous; he was also the representative of the Empire. At the end of the week a great meeting was held in the Hippodrome, and there Alexander determined to confront his adversary. He appeared on horseback, and was received with a doubtful murmur. Benzo rose, and in his character as ambassador, reproached him with ingratitude and rebellion against the Emperor, as having abandoned his See of Lucca and usurped that of Rome.³ "Thou hast ob-

¹ The strange, barbarous rhapsody, the panegyric of Benzo on Henry IV. written partly in verse, in jingling Leonine rhyme, partly in what may hardly be called prose, as a contemporary document is of considerable value. It was written avowedly to obtain preferment; its adulation therefore is even more worthless than that of ordinary panegyrics. But Benzo's account of the affairs in which he was personally engaged is too characteristic not to contain much truth.

² A large quantity of furs was among the presents: "*Clitellarios honustos preciosarum pellium donis.*" — Benzo, ii. c. 1.

³ The translation of bishops was still of doubtful legality, at least in many minds.

tained thy election to the popedom by the aid of Normans, robbers, and tyrants, and by notorious bribery. Hildebrand, that son of Simon Magus, was the chief agent in this detestable merchandise, for which ye have both incurred damnation before God and man." He accused Alexander of acts of cruelty and bloodshed, warned him to retire to Lucca, and after remaining there a month, to proceed to the court of the Emperor, there to undergo whatever penance might be imposed upon him. Alexander calmly answered, that he had received the Roman pontificate, but had not thereby broken his allegiance; that he would send his legate to the court of Henry to declare his will. He then turned his horse and rode off, amid the hootings of the populace — "Away, leper! out, wretch! begone, hateful one!"¹ On his return to the Octavian palace, Benzo assembled what he dignifies by the name of the Senate of Rome. He repeats a strange, coarse speech of Nicolas, the master of the palace, heaping the grossest insults on Hildebrand, and asserting that the election of the Pope must not be abandoned to monks and Normans. Benzo acknowledges the utter instability of the Roman populace, but dwells on the effect of his own eloquence, his lavish promises of mountains of gold,

¹ It is the boast of Benzo: —

"Bellum egi cum Prandello [Hildebrand] atque cum Badaculo [Anselm]
Qui thesaurum sancti Petri ponebant in sacculo.
Eos expuli ex areâ, potitus primaculo."

He expects his reward: —

"Non est magnum tanto regi unum signum facere,
Hoc est dicere Benzoni, veni foras Lazare,
Redditâ tibi mercede, sta sub meo latere."

Lib. iv.

Benzo was a better partisan than poet.

and, if he be taken literally, the joys of Paradise.¹ By these means, and by skilful management of the leaders, he had organized a most powerful party.

Hildebrand, on the other hand, if he came less boldly forward, was neither irresolute nor inactive during this perilous crisis. Hildebrand is acknowledged, no less by the undisguised homage of his admirers than by the discerning hatred of his enemies, throughout the pontificate of Alexander, as something above the Pope. "You made him Pope," writes Damiani, in one of his moments of bitterness, "he made you a god." He was commonly called the Lord of the Lord Pope.² To him were attributed all the more vigorous and warlike measures of Alexander; ³ he held together the Romans of their faction; ⁴ and, according to his antagonist, lavished money with emulous prodigality.⁵ He was the impersonation, as it were, of monkhood.⁶

The Antipope in the mean time advanced with a large

¹ "Nunc pollicendo auri montes, nunc paradisi mellifluos fontes." — Benzo.

² The two well-known epigrams : —

"Papam rite colo, sed te prostratus adoro,
Tu facis hunc Dominum, te facit ille Deum."

"Vivere vis Romæ? clara depromite voce,
Plus Domino Papæ, quam Domno pareo Papæ."

³ "Magis solers vincere effuso mortalium sanguine, quam sacrorum cano-
num gloriosissimo certamine." — Benzo.

⁴ Hildebrand took counsel with Leo, a Jew by descent, with Cencius Frangipani, "et cum brachiato Johanne." Of the two former we shall hear more. The rest of his partisans were *beggars, who lived on the alms of the Church*. — Benzo.

⁵ Benzo says of his opponents that they put their trust not in the Lord, but "in multitudine divitiarum." Whence the wealth at the command of Hildebrand? From the monasteries? the Papal estates? the votive offerings of the faithful? the now religious Normans?

⁶ "Cotidie autem coram domno electi disputabant seniores, quomodo pos-
sint *cuculati Dæmonis* allidere tergiversationes." — Benzo, xi.

force and an ample treasure towards Rome. At Sutri he was met by Benzo, the Imperial ambassador, who had discharged his office of shaking the allegiance of the Romans, and forming a strong faction in the city. Honorius II. advanced towards Rome; the neighboring barons hailed their deliverer from the Pope and his Norman satellites. An embassy arrived from the Byzantine Emperor, or rather from the few Greeks who held their ground in Southern Italy, proposing a confederacy against the Normans. The Normans, partly, perhaps, preoccupied, or setting too high a value on their services, were unusually, suspiciously slow in their movements. The forces of Alexander ventured into the open field; they were defeated and driven within the walls.¹ Cadalous was not strong enough to force his way within the walls, but he crossed the Tiber to put himself in connection with the barons on that side of the city. He fixed his camp at Tusculum, where he received the Greek embassy. He was joined by the Count of Tusculum, the grandson of the famous Alberic.

Godfrey of Lorraine, the Duke of Tuscany, had learned caution by his eventful life: it had ^{Godfrey of Lorraine.} degenerated into craft. He aspired, no doubt with ulterior views, to hold the balance of power in Italy.² Hitherto he had declared for neither Pope.³

¹ There is a rapid but curious view of these affairs in the *Annales Romani*. — Pertz, v. 472.

² He was early an object of jealousy at the Imperial Court: "*Quo comperto imperator Henricus gravi scrupulo perurgeri cœpit, reputans ne forte per eum [Goffredum] animi Italorum, semper avidi novarum rerum, ut a regno Teutonicorum deficerent, sollicitarentur.*" — Lambert Hertzfeld, *sub an.* 1052.

³ See Damiani's Letters on the view of that part of Godfrey's character; his suspicious interview with Cadalous. — vii. 10, etc.

He had not interrupted the march of Cadalous along his frontier ; he had allowed the attack on Rome. He was suspected of too friendly intercourse with Cadalous. Godfrey now appeared with an overpowering force ; but, instead of joining either party, he assumed the lofty tone, not of a mediator, but an arbiter. He proposed that the two Popes should retire, each to his episcopal city, and there await the decision of the contest by the Emperor and the proper authorities. The haughty prelates were obliged to submit. Cadalous, having been first compelled by gentle, but irresistible violence, to surrender all his treasures to Godfrey, with-
A.D. 1062. drew to Parma. Alexander had no alternative but to receive the fair promises of friendship lavished upon him by the Tuscan, and in like manner retired to Lucca. The Church seemed to have surrendered herself by her unnatural quarrel to the superior secular power ; Pope and Antipope waited their doom from the princes of the world.

A sudden revolution in Germany decided the contest
Revolution in
Germany. for the Papacy. That revolution was accomplished by one of the powerful churchmen of the Rhine. It might seem only the daring effort of one bold man for ascendancy ; but there are evident signs that if Hanno of Cologne was not supported by a widely organized conspiracy, which embraced the Hildebrandine party in Italy, he knew that he could reckon on their perfect sympathy. A young widow was the person least suited to govern the ambitious and mutually hostile feudatories of the empire, the almost independent princes and prelates, all aspiring to rule, none disposed to obey. She had power enough to give offence, none to control the refractory. Every grant

or favor made many enemies — that of the fief of Bavaria to Otho of Nordheim, a treacherous and ungrateful instead of an open foe. Whoever became the chief counsellor of the Empress was immediately an object of universal dislike. She now placed her full confidence in the Bishop of Augsburg; but so unscrupulous was the jealousy of the rivals for her favor, so slight the confidence in the sanctity ^{Hanno of Cologne.} of the sacerdotal character, that the bishop's influence was attributed by popular rumor, not discountenanced by the highest in the land, to criminal intercourse. Agnes was no doubt blameless; but the haughtiness of the bishop confirmed the opinion that he must possess more than lawful power over her mind.¹ It was murmured abroad, among the people as well as by these great prelates and princes, that the King, now twelve years old, was kept entirely under female control, and not instructed either in manly studies or chivalrous amusements. A plot for his deliverance, or rather a design to obtain possession of his person, was contrived and conducted with consummate skill by Hanno and Siegfried, the Archbishops of Cologne and Mentz, by Otho of Bavaria, and the Count Ecbert. Hanno of Cologne undertook in person the abduction of the youthful Emperor from his mother's care. At Whitsuntide, after a joyous banquet on an island on the Rhine (that of Saint Suithbert),² Hanno invited the boy to embark in a gay and richly decorated barge, prepared for the occasion. No sooner was he ^{Abduction of the King.} on board than the rowers rose to their oars,

¹ On the death of this prelate Lambert says: "Obiit invisus regi, invisus episcopis omnibus, propter superbe administratam regni gubernationem tempore Imperatricis." — Lambert Hertzfeld.

² Near Neuss.

and the barge went rapidly though against the stream. The affrighted boy, thinking that their design could be nothing but his death, threw himself headlong into the stream. He was rescued by Count Ecbert, who plunged in after him at the peril of his life.¹ The multitude followed along the shore, resenting with loud but vain cries this insult upon the majesty of the Empire. But Hanno pursued his course ; he soothed the popular indignation by artful declarations that he acted only for the public good. The gentle Empress, if wounded in her motherly feelings, relieved from an oppressive burden, contemplated immediate retirement into a convent, but was persuaded for a time to suspend her pious intention.²

The policy of the Empire, as to the Papacy, veered suddenly round. Duke Godfrey could hardly but be cognizant of this conspiracy. Both he and the whole Hildebrandine party hastened to take their advantage. The unworldly Damiani at this crisis cannot keep within his cloister. He plunges with as much zeal as Hildebrand himself, whose secular ambition at times so distresses the saint, into the political turmoil. He writes a letter to Hanno, hailing his success, and urging him to fulfil his design of discomfiting the scaly monster of Parma. His act is that of the good priest Jehoiada rescuing the pious youth of Joas from the influence of the wicked queen Athalia. But he has done nothing unless he tramples on the smouldering brand, the limb of the devil, the Antipope.³

¹ Bonizo, *Annalista Saxo*; Lambert, *sub an.* 1162.

² See the Letters of Damiani (vii. 6, 7, 8) urging her to contempt of imperial greatness.

³ Epist. iii. 6. Damiani is seized in this letter with a classical fit. He compares Cadalous descending on the bed of the apostolic throne in a

A council was summoned at Augsburg. Damiani appeared as a legate, the representative of the monkish and Hildebrandine party. Instead ^{Council of Augsburg.} of a grave deliberation, a singular composition by Damiani was read — a disputation between the advocate of the Empire and the defender of the Papacy. Damiani. It was drawn up with much skill and some moderation. The defender of the Papacy does not openly contest the Imperial right to confirm the election of the Pope, though he suggests a long line of Popes who had ruled without such sanction. But during the infancy of the Emperor that right was in abeyance. The legate of the Roman cardinals had been refused a hearing at the Court; the clergy, therefore, were compelled to proceed to the election of Pope Alexander. In temporal affairs the mother of the Emperor might guide her son; but the Roman Church was the mother of the Emperor in a higher sense, and as his rightful guardian was to act for him in spiritual concerns. Gradually the Imperial advocate yields to the overpowering argument of the Papal defender; and the piece concludes with a fervent prayer that the Empire and the Papacy may henceforth be united in indissoluble alliance; that as the kingdom and the priesthood, founded by one Mediator, were blended together as in one holy sacrament, so by this mysterious union the King might be recognized in the Pontiff, the Pontiff in the Emperor, saving that incommunicable prerogative which belonged to the Pope alone; the King supreme in temporal Courts, the Pontiff with unlimited jurisdiction over the souls of men.

shower of gold with Jupiter descending into the bosom of *Diana*! — if this be not an error of the transcriber.

Damiani's triumph as an orator over an audience who needed no persuasion was most complete. Alexander was declared the rightful Pontiff, with full powers ; but Damiani's fame as a prophet was in some danger. The Oct. 29, 1062. election of the Antipope Cadalous had taken place on the feast of St. Simon and St. Jude in the last year. The council was held on the same festival in the present ; but Cadalous, instead of having closed his impious life, as Damiani had distinctly foretold, was in a state of dangerous activity. Damiani took refuge in the spiritual death inflicted by the excommunicatory decree of the Church at Augsburg.

Alexander II. had returned to Rome ; the Pope recognized by the higher clergy of Rome, by the council of Augsburg, by the Court of the youthful Emperor. But Cadalous did not abandon his pretensions. A large part of the Italian clergy still adhered to his cause ; he was in correspondence with the Empress and her partisans in Germany ; his wealth he devoted to increase his warlike resources ; above all, the barons of his faction in and about Rome, hating a Pope allied with the Normans, occupied the tower of Cencius (the Castle of St. Angelo), and kept the city in constant dread and insecurity.

Hanno of Cologne could not retain the authority which he had acquired with such boldness, but exercised with too much pride. In vain had he heaped imperial grants on his more powerful episcopal brethren, the Archbishops of Salzburg and Magdeburg, the Bishops of Freisingen and Halberstadt.¹ Gunther of Bamberg, for his loyal service, it was alleged, to the Empress, against whom he had been in open rebellion,

¹ Stenzel, *Frankische Kaiser*, i. 217.

received Forcheim, with thirty-six villages and townships, which Henry III. had alienated from the monastery. Those who thus obtained the spoils were discontented that they got no more; those who got nothing were only more exasperated against those who did, and against their misjudging patron. The young King could scarcely forgive the insult of his violent abduction, nor, if he had any natural affection (a doubtful point), his forcible separation from his mother; a deep repugnance against ecclesiastical tyranny may have taken root within his heart, hostile not only to the ambitious churchmen, who were encroaching more and more on the Imperial power, but to the wholesome restraints and holy influences of religion itself. But he could only hope to pass from the control of one hateful ecclesiastic to that of another better able and disposed to win his affections. Adalbert, Archbishop of Bremen, had every quality to rule a court, ^{Adalbert of Bremen.} and the councils of a nation such as Germany then was. Of a commanding person (no one officiated in the Church with so much dignity and splendor), ready eloquence, great knowledge of business, he would not condescend to ask, scarcely to receive favors; while his lavish munificence gathered round him troops of admiring and ardent partisans. To these more worldly distinctions he added those peculiar to his profession, unblemished chastity, saintly piety. The church of Bremen, which he built, was of the noblest in Germany, and served with unrivalled magnificence; and he displayed that haughty humility which, while it constantly stooped to wash the feet of the poor, made him assert his equality with the proudest princes of the Empire. Adalbert became the guardian, the counsellor,

almost the friend and favorite of the youthful Henry ; and in him the loyal subject of the Empire predominated over the punctilious churchman.

Encouraged by this new revolution in the Imperial court, and on the invitation of his allies the Roman nobles, the Antipope made a second unexpected descent upon Rome. His faction commanded the gates of the Leonine city. He entered that district with all his forces ; but in the other quarters of Rome the partisans of Alexander made a brave resistance. Cadalous was attacked in the rear by the Norman troops, hardly escaped being made a prisoner, and was hurried by Cencius and his Roman allies into the castle of St. Angelo. In that impregnable fortress he maintained his position for two years. Rome had two Popes with their armed troops glaring defiance at each other from opposite quarters of the city. The spiritual thunders—each of course, and each in his synod, had hurled his direst excommunication at the other—were drowned in the louder din of arms.

The final possession of the Papacy still hung on the revolutions in the Imperial Court. For two years Adalbert of Bremen maintained his influence by his own stately respectfulness and courteous domination, and by the aid of Count Werner, the younger favorite and companion of Henry.¹ The affairs of state, the disposition of preferments, the Royal grants were left to Adalbert ; while the boy-Emperor and his friend were

¹ Bruno (de bello Saxonico) as a Saxon hated Henry. He is more full, not always decent, and by no means trustworthy, in his history. He charges Adalbert of Bremen with more than unepiscopal connivance: "Stultum dixit esse si non in omnibus satisfieret suæ desideriis adolescentiæ."—i. 3.

allowed to devote themselves too exclusively to the light and unimproving pursuits of youth, the chase and other idle amusements. Adalbert committed the unpardonable error—more than error, the crime—of not endeavoring to bring up the young Emperor in habits of business suited to his station, to teach him the great lesson of commanding men, of commanding himself. Adalbert's own great qualities were leavened by an ostentatious vanity. His magnificent profusion soon exhausted even his vast resources. He could not supply his wants but by encroaching on the possessions of the great and comparatively defenceless monasteries. Some of these indeed, as it were, provoked the spoiler. The secular clergy in Germany—if the hatred between the regulars and seculars had not attained the same height as in other parts of Latin Christendom, in England, and in Lombardy—could not but envy and covet the often ill-gotten and ill-spent estates of the wealthier conventual foundations. While the more rigid monastics denounced the vices of the clergy, and were the stern examples of piety and ascetic devotion, which put to shame the worldly, often warlike, lives of the prelates—not even the most pious declined the Court offerings and grants, which increased with the fame of their piety. The more worldly abbots, on the other hand, aspired in rank, in opulence, even in secular power, to an equality with the prince bishops. They, too, would be prince abbots. There were constant collisions. In a dispute for precedence between the Bishop of Hildesheim and the Abbot of Fulda in the church of Goslar, there was a wild battle A.D. 1063. between their armed followers; the King was present, and with difficulty extricated from the fray. The

Bishop was furious.¹ The Abbot was condemned as the cause of the tumult. The hatred of the seculars against the monks was hardly sated, though the Abbot bought his pardon by fines, which utterly ruined the abbey of Fulda, to the King, to his counsellors, to the Bishop. The feeling ran high against the Abbot. On his return to his convent he was encountered by an insurrection among his own monks, by whom he was hated for his tyranny. The younger and more violent broke from their cloister to lay their grievances before the King. But Henry's counsellors, Hanno of Cologne, Otho of Bavaria, would not encourage this monastic rebellion. The Abbot was restored by the soldiers of the King, and took his revenge on the contumacious monks. Some were publicly whipped, others condemned to fasting and imprisonment, some drafted off to other convents; but according to their birth and connections was their punishment.²

The great metropolitans, though in possession of their splendid sees, and now ruling absolutely in the
Plunder of
the Abbays. King's councils, were not great enough for their ambition. They did not plunder the magnates or the bishops, but it was from fear, not from respect. They wielded the whole power of the Empire; they sold all promotions, ecclesiastical and secular: yet this was not enough; the defenceless abbots were at their

¹ Lambert of Hertzfeld, *sub ann.* 1063. "Tum vero urgebat et ille Apostolicæ Sanctitatis et Mosaicæ mansuetudinis episcopus, qui tanti sanguinis manus suas Deo consecraverat, et violatæ ecclesiæ injurias truculentius atque inimitius quam rex suas persequabatur . . . Abbatem, præter acerbitatem rei, quæ acciderat odium quoque gravabat nominis monachici, quod inveterata malitia hominis sæculi semper opprimere atque obfuscare conabatur." Lambert was a monk of Hertzfeld, not of Aschaffenburg. —Pertz.

² "De singulis tamen non pro modo culpæ, sed pro natalitium suorum claritate vel obscuritate sumptum est supplicium." — Lambert.

mercy. Siegfried of Mentz was as rapacious as the Archbishops of Cologne and Bremen; for in this the common interests of Hanno and of Adalbert joined them in a common league. They condescended to throw part of the spoils to the King, and so bought his support. They asserted the King's power over the abbots and lands of the abbeys, and his right to grant them away, to be as full, as over his bailiffs and other administrators of the royal domains. The Archbishop of Bremen attempted to seize Laurisheim and New Corbey. Corbey was, however, rescued from his grasp. The Abbot of St. Lavers stood on the defensive. Archbishop Siegfried seized Seligenstadt. Hanno of Cologne, not content with a ninth part of the Imperial treasure, had for his share Cornelius-Munster and Malmedy. St. Remacle wrested his cloister from the rapacious prelate by wonders, in which his monks were singularly skilful.¹ The Bishop of Spires had two abbeys: the Archbishops of Magdeburg, Saltzburg, the Bishops of Halberstadt, Freisingen, Minden, Bamberg, whole villages, with large privileges. Nor were the nobles without their portion. Otho of Bavaria had the abbey of Kempten; the Duke of Saxony the castle of Retzburg; Werner, the King's favorite, estates of Charlemagne's favored Abbey of Hertzfeld. Werner added insult to spoliation. The monks of Hertzfeld took prayer and fasting against him. "See," said Werner, scoffingly, to the King, "I have roused these

¹ See the *Triumphus S. Remacii*, in which the monks of Etable contested the possession of Malmedy with Hanno, and by playing off the popular superstition, which the bishop and the King saw through, but could not resist, maintained possession of their property. — *Apud Chapeauville, Gesta Pontificum Leodensium*, ii. 517 *et seqq.* Floto (*Heinrich der Vierte*), i. p. 286 *et seqq.* gives this at great length.

monks to most unwonted devotion; they have taken to fasting and prayer." — And men wondered that the young King was not imbued with awe and reverence for the Church!

In the depression of the monasteries and the invasion of their possessions the rival prelates, Hanno of Cologne and Adalbert of Bremen, might agree: no one repudiated his share of the plunder.¹ But the strife between these two men was a kind of prelude to the great conflict between the Empire and the Church. Hanno sought to strengthen his power by establishing his friends and kindred in the great bishoprics. Adalbert aspired to be surrounded by a vassalage of temporal nobles. The minority of Henry was one long strife of ambition and violence, in which the Churchmen ever took the lead, strangely crossed with acts of the most profound and self-denying devotion. At the time when a powerful confederacy was secretly forming against the overweening power of Adalbert of Bremen, many of the greatest prelates in Germany were seized with a sudden passion of pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Siegfried of Mentz broke off his career of plunder. Gunther of Bamberg, Otho of Ratisbon, William of Utrecht, with many other distinguished ecclesiastics of France, as well as Germany, set out in the autumn of 1064 for the Holy Land. Their imprudent display of wealth excited the astonishment and, of course, the cupidity of the wild Mohammedans, through whose territories they passed. In one affray with these rude enemies, they escaped massacre only by the personal courage and strength of

¹ So writes Lambert, one of the sufferers. Compare Stenzel, *Die Frankische Kaiser*, i. 221. Stenzel in his *Beilage* gives a long and full list of lands seized by the great Prelates.

the Bishop of Bamberg ; and they were so fortunate as to buy the protection of a more powerful chieftain, who kept his word with true eastern fidelity. They returned to Germany, Gunther of Bamberg to die, Siegfried of Mentz to plunge again into the world ; he would compensate himself for the hardships of his pilgrimage by bolder gratification of his ambition and rapacity.

Adalbert of Bremen had ruled too absolutely, too ostentatiously in the court of the young King. His virtues were not less dangerous than his faults. His transcendent abilities awoke jealousy, his magnificence compelled him to more insatiate rapacity. He had more than his share in the plunder of the Empire.

The prelates and the secular princes combined for his overthrow — Hanno of Cologne, Siegfried of Mentz, Rudolph of Swabia, Otho of Bavaria, and the counts of Saxony — who hated Adalbert, and longed to plunder his wealthy bishopric, which in the north of Germany overshadowed their power and riches. They obtained the support of Godfrey of Tuscany, now in Germany. At a great diet at Tribur they boldly laid before the young King the alternative — the abandonment of his archiepiscopal minister, or the loss of his crown. Henry had been already cowed by the death of his favorite Count Werner in a fray at Ingelheim. He attempted to fly to Goslar with the insignia of the Empire. His palace was surrounded. Adalbert of Bremen was in danger of his life, and with difficulty, under a strong guard, he reached his bishopric. But the fallen man must fall still further. Duke Ordulf of Saxony, his son Magnus and his brother Herman, broke into the territories of the See. They threatened death to the archbishop ; he sought concealment in a distant

estate. At length he was compelled to make terms, by which he granted one third of his vast estates as a fief of the archiepiscopate to Magnus of Saxony ; other estates to other secular princes.

The magnificent prelate who aspired to be the Patriarch of the north of Germany had to endure poverty. Alms ceased to be distributed in the splendid church of Bremen. So the administration of affairs returned to the bishops.¹

The fall of Adalbert crushed the lingering hopes of the Antipope Cadalous. Latterly he had been a prisoner rather than the master in the castle of St. Angelo ; and Cencius only on hard terms permitted this useful ally or rallying-point to his own faction, that of the old Roman nobles, to escape. Cadalous was obliged to pay 300 pounds of silver for the privilege of making a hasty and ignominious flight to the north of Italy.²

Hanno of Cologne, now all-powerful at the court of King Henry, had espoused the cause of Alexander II. ; he was desirous, as a churchman, to put an end to this perilous and disgraceful schism ; but he had too much of German pride to abandon altogether the imperial claims. With his confederates, the German princes and prelates, he summoned, in the name of the Emperor, a Council to meet at Mantua to decide the great cause. Himself, with a large retinue of German princes and three hundred knights, proceeded to Rome. A discussion was held with Hanno of Cologne on one side, Hildebrand on the other ; Hanno asserting the right of the King, the Patrician of Rome, to con-

¹ "Sic iterum rerum publicarum administratio ad episcopos rediit." — Lambert. The temporal nobles were not too faithful to Adalbert.

² "Consenso strigosissimo equo inde solus aufugit." — Bonizo.

firm the Papal election; Hildebrand, the indefeasible liberties of the Church.

Alexander, or Alexander's counsellors, thought it more wise to confirm his title by the authority of a council. He condescended to appear, not doubtful of the event, at Mantua.

The Council of Mantua declared Alexander the legitimate Pope; but hardly was this done, when the city was disturbed by a sudden irruption of the soldiers of Cadalous, swarming through the city and heaping scorn on Alexander. Cadalous had raised these troops in his neighboring diocese of Parma: but Godfrey, Duke of Tuscany, the patron of Alexander, had guaranteed the security of the Pope. He drove the Parmesans in ignominious flight from the town.¹ The Lombard prelates threw themselves at the feet of Alexander and implored his forgiveness. This forgiveness is said to have extended to Cadalous himself, who nevertheless, though his friends fell off, never renounced the title of Pope. He died at last, almost forgotten by the world, except by the hatred of his enemies, which pursued him beyond the grave.² But either lest the German or Imperial interest should be too much depressed, or as the price of his abandonment of the Antipope, the author of the schism, Guibert the Chancellor was rewarded with the Archbishopric of Ravenna.

During the whole pontificate of Alexander II. the

¹ Lambert expresses the feelings of religious men on these scenes: "Homines, non ut quondam ut præessent ecclesiæ Dei injectâ manu trahebantur, sed ne non præessent armata manu præliabantur, fundebantque mutuo sanguinem non pro ovibus Christi, sed ne non dominarentur ovibus Christi. *Anselmus tamen, qui et Alexander, et virtute militum et favore principum sedem obtinuit.*" — *Sub ann. 1064.*

² "Eodem tempore Cadalous Parmensis Episcopus corpore et animâ defunctus est." — Bonizo, p. 810.

Strife about married Clergy. strife in Lombardy and in other parts of Northern Italy had continued with but remitting obstinacy. Alexander in his first address, as a Milanese, to the clergy and people of Italy, had declared the enforced celibacy of the priesthood the great object of his pontifical ambition.¹ Damiani did not hold his peace; he bitterly complained that the Simoniac and Nicolaitan heresies, which he thought he had suppressed, had broken out again. He addressed, or more actively promulgated, an invective against the married clergy, even more furious than before. Phineas is his favorite example of zeal, Eli of criminal indulgence in the fathers of the Church, as abstaining from using the sword of vengeance.² Damiani, Pope Alexander, fulminated not in vain.

Landulph, one of the sworn triumvirate of Milan, A.D. 1065. had died; but a more implacable adversary of the married clergy rose up in his place—his brother Herlembald,³ of a stern, warlike character. An event

¹ "Speramus autem in eo qui de virgine dignatur est nasci, quia nostri ministerii tempore sancta clericorum castitas exaltabitur, et incontinentium luxuria cum cæteris hæresibus confundetur." — Epist. Alex. II. ad clerum populumque Mediolanensem.

² See two letters to Ariald, v. 14, 15. Damiani's Commentary on the Old Testament is rather bold. He confounds Phineas with Elijah! Phineas was rewarded for his act of zeal with a life of 620 years. Eli's guilt is aggravated, for he was a *metropolitan*, Hophni and Phineas only *bishops*. The coarse indecency of this model of monkhood might provoke laughter, if laughter were not sobered by disgust: "Sanctis eorum femoribus volui seras apponere; tentavi genitalibus sacerdotum, ut ita loquar, continentiae fibulas adhibere." — De Cœleb. Sacerd. Opusc. If the evil were concealed, it might, perhaps, be tolerated; but it is public, notorious; names, places, are bruited abroad: "Nomina concubinarum, socerorum quoque et socrum, fratrum denique et quorumlibet propinquorum." If lavish gifts, jests, secret meetings, betray them not; "omnis dubietas tollitur," there are "uteri tumentes et pueri vagientes."

³ Herlembald's person and character are described at length. — Landulph, iii. 13.

in Herlembald's early life had embittered his heart against the less rigid clergy. His plighted bride had behaved lightly with a priest: Herlembald indignantly broke off his marriage. He then made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and was just returned, with his whole soul full of religious enthusiasm. He soon ruled in Milan, by espousing the faction of the people against the nobles;¹ and with their aid proceeded to assail the married priests. It was a spiritual tyranny exercised by a layman, though in conjunction with his brother-colleague Ariald, and maintained by armed partisans. Obnoxious priests were dragged from the altar, and consigned to shame and insult.² The services of the Church, the most holy sacraments, were suspended altogether, or administered only by the permission of Herlembald.

It is said that, in order to keep his rude soldiery in pay, he made every one in holy orders take a solemn oath that he had never known woman since the day of his ordination. For those who refused the oath, their whole property was confiscated. The lowest rabble, infected with Paterinism, poor artisans and ass-drivers, furtively placed female ornaments in the chambers of priests, and then attacking their houses, dragged them out and plundered their property. Herlembald assumed the title of standard-bearer of the Church. Pope Alexander, at the instigation of Hildebrand, bestowed upon him a consecrated banner.³ Sometimes these ecclesiastical tribunes condescended to argument and expostulation; but their usual reasoning was force. Herlem-

¹ See note quoted from Petrus Arragonensis by Puricelli, ad Vit. Arialdi, apud Bolland: June 27.

² Landulph, iii. 20.

³ Vit. Arialdi.

bald assumed a power far above that of the archbishop. His followers contested, indeed, the title and authority of the archbishop, no doubt as guilty of simony, of which they had constituted themselves judges as well as avengers.¹

Guido at length, after nearly nine years of silent strife, determined on an attempt to throw off the yoke. The churches of Milan were for the most part without ministers. The married clergy had been expelled, and there were none to take their place.² A synod at Novara

¹ "Guido qui dicebatur archiepiscopus." And Ariald in his hour of martyrdom will not own Guido for archbishop.—Vit. Ariald.

² Among the most curious parts of Landulph's history, and among the most singular documents of his age, is his account of a conference held in the presence of Herlembald on the marriage of the clergy. The speeches on both sides are given at length. The debate is opened by Guibert, the archdeacon, who boldly broaches the doctrine that all Christians, laity as well as clergy, are priests: "Forsitan cogitatis, quod de Laicis tantum dicat, de quibus non est dubium habere conjugem. Omnes tamen, Laici et Clerici, *quicunque sunt filii ecclesiæ, sacerdotes sunt.*" Landulph, perhaps, has not done justice to the arguments of Ariald; more than justice to his opponents. The most remarkable speech of all, however, is that of Andrew, "Sacerdos Decumanus." He dwelt most vividly on the gross immoralities which, as he believed—and he appealed to general experience—inevitably followed the interdiction of marriage to the clergy: "Et si mihi de naturâ humanâ non credis, maximè non credis de ordine nostro, qui dum magis constringitur, amplius illicitis accenditur; vel tibi, quod olim fuisti, vel eras, [vel] esse poteris, crede. Vetando unam et propriam uxorem centum fornicatrices ac adulteria mille concedis; præterea vitium detestabile (ob quod quidam ex tuis simulantes sese caste vivere uxoribus falsâ religione dimissis, vitio imbuti detestabili, in theatro populi tracti, et in fronte decocti sunt), te amicè tangendo deterreat." He indignantly inveighs against the violence of the celibate faction: "thou hast separated us from our wives, thou that art more righteous than the Apostles; holier than the Prophets; purer than the Patriarchs; not by justice, not by charity, but by spears and swords, and every kind of persecution." He accuses them of holding the ascetic doctrines of "those of Monteforte," who proscribed all connexion between the sexes. He repels the argument that a priest cannot offer at the altar if polluted by contact with a wife. The priest who has a wife cannot serve God faithfully, if he loves his wife more than God: that is all. Yet Andrew does not pretend to excuse a priest who marries after he is in orders: he must suffer the penalty of that breach of discipline; but

(1065) summoned Herlembald and Ariald to render an account of their proceedings. Their answer was silent contempt. At length the sentence of excommunication was pronounced against Ariald and Herlembald as refractory. But the inflexible Ariald appealed to Rome. He sent letters to inquire what course was to be pursued with this bishop, whom he loaded with the appellations of simoniac and adulterer. Damiani again blew a fierce blast from his monastic trumpet, and urged on these indefatigable warriors to extirpate this Nicolaitan heresy, as Jesus, from whose mouth goes forth the two-edged sword, will hew down all his enemies, and pour their blood on the earth.¹

But Ariald presumed beyond his strength. He had returned from Rome armed with full powers, with the ban of the Church pronounced against Guido, which had been extorted from the reluctant Pope by the more intrepid Hildebrand. The people of Milan had borne his tyrannous sway; they had aided him in his persecution of the married clergy; and of those accused of simony. But now the manifest object of Ariald and Herlembald was the total subjugation of Milan to Rome, the abrogation of all her peculiar rites and privileges. When, therefore, Ariald began to interfere with the ritual, received by constant tradition from St. Ambrose himself — to command a fast on certain days on which St. Ambrose had appointed no fast — to preach against, to treat as heathen a fast and procession on Ascension Day, instituted by St. Ambrose — he fell at once from

he protests against dissolving, even in the case of such priest, the indissoluble union. — Landulph, iii. c. 25. Compare with this Damiani's dispute with the chaplain of Duke Godfrey, Epist. v. 13.

¹ Epist. v. 14.

the commanding height of his popularity.¹ The factions of the different litanies met in conflict on more equal terms. The Archbishop himself, whose life had been in danger during the strife, headed the insurrection. The whole of Milan was summoned to meet in the great church at Pentecost. Guido appealed to the people: "Let all who love St. Ambrose leave the church." Of seven thousand persons, but twelve remained with Ariald and with Herlembald. They stood near the altar to protect or to be protected by it. The partisans of Guido rushed to the attack; the clergy selected Ariald, the laity Herlembald, for their victim. Ariald was dragged from the church sorely wounded; Herlembald escaped better. At night his followers rallied, and rescued them both from their enemies. Six men, probably of note, were killed. The palace of the archbishop was stormed and pillaged. They then attacked the church. The aged Guido barely escaped, sorely maltreated in the tumult. But the nobles, the more distinguished of the citizens, the vassals of the Church, would endure this tyranny no longer. Guido of Landriano placed himself at their head; the city was laid under interdict; no service was to be performed, no bell sounded, till Ariald should be driven from the city. So great was the fury of Milan against Ariald, that he fled to Legnano. He fell into the hands of Oliva, the niece of Archbishop Guido. She carried him to an island on the Lago Maggiore. There she demanded whether he would acknowledge Guido for archbishop (he had been excommunicated by Rome). "As long as my tongue can speak," he replied, "I will not acknowledge him."

June 28,
1066.

¹ Tristan Calchi, vi. 133.

The servants of Oliva, after a more shameful mutilation, tore out his tongue, and left him half-dead. Landulph, his former colleague, had suffered before his death from a disease in the tongue; and thus, says the hostile historian, "God punished these men by the member which was the cause of all their wickedness." Ariald soon found and still holds his place as a martyr in the annals of the church.¹

The strife was not allayed by the death of Ariald, nor by the appearance of two Papal legates, the Cardinal Bishop of Sylva Candida, and the Cardinal priest John Minuto. They passed strong constitutions against simony and the married clergy.² Herlembald, who had fled to Pavia, returned, regained his power, A.D. 1068-9. and, openly supported by the Pope's authority, reorganized his tyranny. Guido, as he advanced in years, became more consciously incapable of rule. He had been archbishop twenty-seven years, the last ten of civil war. He determined to vacate the see: he burdened it with a fixed pension to himself, and then made it over to a certain Godfrey. To him he resigned the pastoral staff, and the ring of investiture bestowed by the Emperor. Godfrey crossed the Alps, and promised the King, if he would grant the investiture, to destroy Pateria (so the adversaries of the monastic party opprobriously named them), take Herlembald alive, and send him prisoner into Germany. The Emperor, won, or bribed, as it is said, ratified the appointment.³

¹ The least credible part of Landulph, the historian's, story is the public confession of his errors, which he ascribes to Ariald, who humbly owns himself guilty of the blood of his fellow-citizens, as the cause of countless fornications, adulteries, and even worse crimes, among the clergy.

² "Constitutiones, quas S. Legati Mediolanensibus observandas præscribunt." — Mansi, xix.

³ Benzo.

But Herlembald, who now conducted himself not merely as secular tyrant, but as a Pope in Milan, refused to acknowledge Godfrey, expelled him from the city, and besieged him in Castiglione. Guido, not receiving his stipulated pension, annulled his resignation, and resumed his state as archbishop. But he unwisely trusted himself to the faith of Herlembald; he was seized, and shut up in a monastery till his death.¹

Before the death of Guido, Herlembald had set up a certain Atto,² nominated by himself with the legate of Rome by his side, and without regard to the Church of Milan or their liege lord the Emperor. Atto was but a youth, just entered into holy orders. The people were furious, rose and attacked the archbishop's palace, tore him from his refuge in an upper chamber, dragged him by the legs and arms into the church, and there compelled him to renounce his dignity. The Roman legate hardly escaped with his robes torn.

During this strife Milan had suffered two dreadful fires, A.D. 1071-75. which burned down some of the finest churches, as well as a large part of the city. These calamities goaded the factions to more relentless cruelty: as each party would attribute them to the direct wrath of God, so each would receive them as the summons to wreak vengeance on their adversaries, thus designated the foes of God as of themselves. Herlembald, now strong in the armed protection of the great Hildebrand³ (we have reached his pontificate), maintained his power; yet so vigorous and inflexible was the party called that of the married clergy, that it prolonged the contest on the

¹ Giulini, iv. 140; Verri, p. 173.

² Atto was sanctioned as archbishop by the Pope in 1072.

³ Landolph (the historian) says of Herlembald: "*Solum Romani illius Hildebrandi auscultabat consultum.*"

whole during twenty years,¹ and obtained at last a temporary triumph in the death of Herlembald.²

This man at length fell in an insurrection : the standard of St. Peter was trampled in the dust. Liutprand, a priest of his faction, was mutilated, his ears and his nose cut off. His enemies would scarcely allow Herlembald decent burial. A solemn procession passed to the Ambrosian Church, with hymns of thanksgiving for the deliverance of the Church of Milan from her oppressor.³ Yet he, too, is placed as a martyr in the calendar of Christian saints.⁴ The canonization of these two religious demagogues, who, whatever may be thought of their spiritual objects, governed by popular insurrections and plunder, by carnage — which did not respect the most sacred persons, by exaction, and by every kind of persecution, closes this melancholy chapter in church history.

It was not in Milan alone that the war raged against the married clergy ; nor wholly in the Milan- 1075-6. ese that the married clergy were strong enough to maintain a long and obstinate resistance to the Hildebrandine yoke.⁵ In Monza, in Cremona, in Piacenza, in Pavia, in Padua, in Asti, fierce feuds, as fierce as the later con-

¹ "Crescebat quotidie numerus infidelium, et de die in diem numerus minuebatur Paterinorum." — Bonizo, p. 813.

² The enemies of Herlembald were the Capitanei and Valvassores (these Hullman interprets bas vassaux), the simple populace: "Dicentes se integritatem beati Ambrosii velle jurare."

³ Arnulf.

⁴ In his epitaph it is said: "Hunc Veneris servi perimunt, Simonisque magistri."

⁵ Verri in his *Storia Milanese* adduces strong reasons for supposing that the married priests continued to exercise their functions, however with greater caution, in the Milanese. A synod, held in 1098, condemns the abuse of the clergy handing down their benefices to their children by a kind of hereditary succession.

flicts of Guelfs and Ghibellines, disturbed the streets, not without bloodshed. Alexander II. addressed a hortatory letter to the Cremonese ; it rung like a tocsin through the city. The people rose upon the married clergy.¹

But in Florence the secular clergy, headed by Peter, the Bishop of Florence, opposed a long but vain resistance to the monks, those especially of Vallombrosa, with their abbot, hereafter sainted, John Gualberto. The legend of this holy man is among the most striking in hagiology. He was of noble Florentine birth ; his brother had been murdered. The honor of his house, paternal love, the solemn imprecation of his father, imposed upon Gualberto the sacred duty of avenging his brother's blood. He brooded in fixed and sullen determination over this settled purpose. One day (it was Good Friday) he met his destined victim, the murderer, in a narrow pass : he drew his sword to plunge it to the heart of the guilty man. The assassin attempted no defence, but threw himself from his horse, and folded his arms over his breast in the form of a cross. Gualberto held his arm—he forgave for the sake of that holy sign. He rode on to pay his devotions in the Church of San Miniato ; the crucifix seemed to bow towards him, as if in approval of his holy deed. From that moment Gualberto was a monk in heart as in life. He found a hermitage under the dark pines of Vallombrosa, on the banks of the Acqua Bella. The hermitage grew into a monastery ; and of all cloisters none was so rigid as that of Vallombrosa ; later times had seen no monk so austere, so self-mortified, as John Gualberto. Peter, Bishop of Florence, was accused as a

¹ See authorities in Theiner, p. 133 ; Benzo, p. 808, 9.

Simoniac ; the protection of Peter Damiani, who at first endeavored to repress the intemperate zeal of the monks, may seem to absolve the prelate from this charge. But the secular clergy of Florence were deeply tainted it is said by this vice ; they lived separate, there were no colleges of canons — an unmarried clergyman was rare — they were intent on their worldly interests, the heritage of their children, or provisions for their families.¹

The strife lasted for many years. Gualberto denounced Peter, the simoniac Bishop, in the streets of Florence ; the monks of Vallombrosa renounced all allegiance to their sullied prelate. Appeals to Rome were in vain ; the Pope Alexander inclined to milder and more conciliatory measures ; Hildebrand hailed the kindred spirit of his friend, the abbot Gualberto, and maintained with his more than Papal authority the cause of the monks.

But the monks had determined on, they had repeatedly urged, an appeal to a higher authority even than Rome, to God himself. They demanded the ordeal of fire. There was a fierce commotion in Florence. Many of the clergy had been awed by the denunciations of Gualberto and the monks ; they fell off from the bishop, they declared that they could not obey a simoniac prelate. The civil authorities were summoned to drive the refractory priests from their residences. The

¹ “*Quæ enim lingua etiamsi ferrea ipsius cuncta posset referre bona ? Quæ clericorum congregatio vitam erat ducens communem ? Quis clericorum propriis et paternis rebus solummodo non studebat ? Qui potius inveniretur, proh dolor ! qui non esset uxoratus vel concubinarius ? De simoniâ quid dicam ? Omnes pene ecclesiastico sordines hæc mortifera bellua devoraverat, ut, qui ejus morsum evaserit, rarus inveniretur.*” — Andreas Srum. in Vita S. Gualberti, apud Bolland, July 12. Atto says: “*Exemplo vero ipsius et admonitionibus delicati cleri spretis connubiis cœperunt simul in Ecclesiis stare, et communem ducere vitam.*”

populace arose, ever on the sterner, as they thought the more religious, side ; women ran about rending their veils, beating their breasts, and shrieking wildly. There was a loud cry : “ Christ, thou art driven out ! Simon Magus will endure thee no longer ! ”

A great rout, at least 5,000, with monks at their head, marched forth to Settimo, a monastery dependent on Vallombrosa, a few miles from Florence. At Settimo had been prepared two lofty scaffolds ; between them a narrow path, heaped with dry wood. The scaffolds were crowded with spectators, who gazed in transports of weeping devotion on the celebration of the mass below, by a popular monk named Peter,¹ appointed as the champion of his cause by Gualberto. As the *Agnus Dei* was sung, four priests advanced, one bearing the cross, one with holy water, one with the swinging censer, one with two lighted torches. There was a wild intonation throughout all the people of the *Kyrie Eleison* — prayers to Christ, to the Virgin, to St. Peter — then all was silence. The mass was over ; Peter, the monk, advanced in slow procession, amid the chanting of the *Litanies* and of the *Psalms* — he bore the cross. An abbot uttered a solemn prayer that this ordeal might root out the simony which reigned throughout the world. Peter knelt and prayed with deep fervor : “ If Peter, Bishop of Florence, be a simoniac, may I pass unscathed through the flames.” “ Amen ! ” answered the awe-struck crowd. He gave and received the kiss of peace from his brethren. He waved the cross over the burning wood ; walked slowly through the hissing flames,

¹ The monk who passed the ordeal was called afterwards *Petrus Igneus*. He became Bishop of Albano. Berthold *Apud Pertz*, with note of *Usserman*, p. 273 ; the whole account chiefly from Berthold, in 1071, p. 109.

over the glowing embers. He passed unhurt; it was said that even the hairs on his feet were unsinged. All rushed around him, pressed his feet, the folds of his garments. There was one shout of triumph, demanding the degradation of the Bishop. Peter, a man of gentle character, yielded to the storm; he withdrew from Florence, but he retained his bishopric till his death.¹

The death of Alexander II. (after a pontificate of nearly twelve years, including the contest Oct. 1, 1061; April 21, 1073. with Cadalous) was neither sudden nor unexpected; the election of his successor could not but be a subject of intense public anxiety. In Anselm of Lucca, the pontificate had been restored to Italy: would Rome any longer endure the bitter ignominy, that no one of her clergy, according to the precedence assigned to them by the decree of Pope Nicolas and the Lateran Council, was fit to be elevated to the shrine of St. Peter? Hildebrand had already for more than two pontificates been virtually Pope; the popular voice had described him as Lord of the Pope; would he still condescend to a subordinate station, and out of humility, policy, timidity, decline the ostensible supremacy? An unusual fast of three days might indicate that some measure of more than ordinary solemnity was in contemplation.

The clergy were assembled in the Lateran church to celebrate the obsequies of Alexander; Hildebrand, as Archdeacon, was performing the mournful service. At

¹ Theiner adduces evidence that he was recognized by the Pope some time after his supposed degradation. The Mantuan biographer of S. Gualberto will not permit his triumph to be incomplete. The inscription bears:—

“Ast ille ejectus Petrus fuit illico ab omni
Sede suâ sacrâ Pontificisque loco.”

once from the whole multitude of clergy and people arose a simultaneous cry, "Hildebrand is Pope!" "St. Peter chooses the Archdeacon Hildebrand!" The Archdeacon rushed towards the pulpit to allay the tumult, and either with real or assumed modesty to repel the proffered honor; but Hugo the White, a cardinal presbyter of weight and influence, yet under the accusation of simony and excommunicated by the late Pope, eager perhaps to retrieve his endangered position, at once came forward and made himself heard above the acclamations of the multitude. "Well know ye," he said, "beloved brethren, that since the days of the blessed Leo this tried and prudent Archdeacon has exalted the Roman See, and delivered this city from many perils. Wherefore, since we cannot find any one better qualified for the government of the Church or the protection of the city, we, the bishops and cardinals, with one voice elect him as the pastor and bishop of your souls." The voice of Hugo was drowned in universal cries, "It is the will of St. Peter; Hildebrand is Pope." Hildebrand was led to the Papal throne; he was presented to the people as a man of profound theological knowledge, as a man of prudence, a lover of equity and justice, firm in adversity, temperate in prosperity; according to the apostolic words, of good conversation; blameless, modest, sober, chaste, hospitable, one that ruleth his own house; a man well brought up in the bosom of his Mother Church, and advanced already for his distinguished merits to the dignity of Archdeacon. "This our Archdeacon then we choose, to be called henceforth and for ever by the name of Gregory, for our Pontiff, as the successor of the Apostle." He was immediately arrayed with the scarlet robe, crowned with the Papal

tiara, and, reluctant and in tears, enthroned in the chair of St. Peter.¹

Hildebrand wept ! Were they tears of pride and joy, or of humility and sadness, or of mingling and conflicting emotions ? It was impossible but that his ambition, his conscious superiority, must long have contemplated this ultimate advancement ; but even his firm mind, in its profound religious devotion, may have been shaken at this crisis in his life. The higher Hildebrand estimated the power of the Pope, the more awful the responsibility. According to his view the Pope stood alone on earth between God and man ; the destinies of the human race, the temporal no less than the eternal destinies, which must depend on the issue of the imminent contest into which he was about to plunge, hung henceforward upon his acts and words. The monk was not entirely dead within him ; to his monastic friends, especially to Desiderius, Abbot of Monte Casino, afterwards his successor, he imparts, with seeming sincerity, the struggle of mind with which he undertook the inevitable office.²

He commenced his reign with temper and prudence. The decree of Nicolas II. had acknowledged that, in the last instance, after the nomination of the Cardinals, the ratification by the clergy and by the people of Rome, the assent of the Emperor was necessary to complete the full legal title. Gregory despatched messengers to Germany to inform Henry IV. of his elevation, and to receive his assent. It is said that at the same time he warned the Emperor not to sanction his nomination ; the warning was couched in words of pro-

¹ Bonizo, sub ann. 1073. Compare Jaffé, *Regesta*, p. 401.

² April 24.

phetic minacity: "If I be indeed made Pope, I must no longer patiently endure your great and flagrant excesses."¹ But this is probably the language of later admirers of the great theocrat, who would at once invest him in all the terrors which he afterwards assumed. In the decree of Nicolas the assent of the Emperor had been reduced almost to a form; Gregory was a rigid and punctilious observer of forms, and it was most important that there should be no flaw whatever in his charter, no defect of which his enemies might avail themselves hereafter in his title. But by such language, thus more than usually offensive and contemptuous, Gregory himself raised the form into a reality. The words imputed to him absolutely submitted the validity of his election to the Emperor, and acknowledged the Emperor's power to cancel his promotion. It is utterly irreconcilable with his character, directly at issue with the lofty principles so soon, so firmly, and so haughtily maintained by Hildebrand, to suppose that if the Emperor had refused his assent he would quietly have descended from the Pontifical throne; it was either base hypocrisy, or a perfidious attempt to betray the Emperor at once into hostile proceedings. If it be true — if the address of Gregory was more severe than the ordinary parental admonitions which were wont to form part of the Papal addresses to sovereigns — if more than a grave or tender remonstrance against his personal conduct — Gregory must have been prepared to discharge his conscience with this deliberate defiance, with

¹ "Interminatusque (sc. al.) si ejus electioni assensum præbuisset, nunquam ejus nequitiam patienter portaturum." — Bonizo, p. 811. "Ne assensum præberet, ipsum attentius exoravit. Quod si non faceret certum sibi esset, quod graviore et manifestos ipsius excessus impunitos nullatenus toleraret." — Cardin. Arragon. in Vit.

which he cancelled beforehand any claim upon his gratitude for the assent of the Emperor, and held himself at full liberty to appear as an open adversary of the Empire in defence of the loftiest pretensions of the Papacy. It was presuming, too, somewhat over boldly on the timidity and irresolution of the Emperor and his council. Hildebrand's character was too well known—it had been known for too many years—not to excite apprehensions of his ambitious views in Germany. He was an Italian—a Roman prelate. His austerity would alarm all who were either guilty or under the imputation of simoniacal or incontinent lives; he would have many adversaries even among the better, but not unambitious, German Prelates. Henry was in truth strongly urged to annul at once the election. “If he did not at once tame this violent man, on no one would the storm fall so heavily as on himself.” Count Eberhard of Nellenberg was sent to Rome to demand of the Romans why they had presumed, contrary to ancient usage, to elect the Pope without previous consultation of the Emperor; if the answer was unsatisfactory, Eberhard was to insist on the abdication of Gregory.¹ But Count Eberhard was received with courteous deference by Gregory, who declared that he had not sought, but that the honor had been forced upon him by the clergy and the people. He had, however, deferred, and should defer, his inauguration until he had received the assent of the King. This skilful concession was accepted. Eberhard returned to Germany. Gregory Bishop of Vercelli, the Chancellor of Italy,

¹ Lambert. Floto rejects this, but Lambert could hardly have invented Eberhard's mission. The high Papalists, less politic than Hildebrand, afterwards denied the fact, because they would not acknowledge the right.

was sent to Rome to signify the Imperial assent.¹ Hildebrand thus assumed the Pontifical power unembarrassed by a contested title. Yet the watchful Pope still took every opportunity of asserting indirectly the independence of the Papacy. His name of Gregory VII. was a declaration that Gregory VI., whose Pontificate had been annulled by the Imperial authority, was a legitimate Pope.

¹ Bonizo.

BOOK VII.—CONTEMPORARY CHRONOLOGY.

POPPS.	EMPEROR OF GERMANY.	KING OF FRANCE.	KINGS OF ENGLAND.	KINGS OF SPAIN.	KINGS OF DENMARK.	EMPERORS OF THE EAST.
A.D. 1073 Gregory VII. 1085	A.D. 1056 Henry IV. 1106	A.D. 1060 Philip I. 1108	A.D. 1066 William the Con- queror 1087	A.D. 1072 Alphonso VI., the Valiant 1106	A.D. 1076 Canute IV., the Saint 1086	A.D. 1072 Duca 1078
1080 (Guibert. Clement III. Antipope) 1100					1086 Olaus II. 1096	1078 Nicephorus Botoniates 1081
1086 Victor III. 1087					1096 Eric the Good.	1081 Alexius Comnenus 1118
1088 Urban II. 1089			1087 William Rufus 1100	1067 Sancho — 1094 Peter I. 1103		
ARCHBISHOPS OF MILAN.	ARCHBISHOPS OF MENTU.	ARCHBISHOPS OF RHEIMS.	ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.	EARL OF PORTUGAL.	KINGS OF NAPLES.	KINGS OF HUNGARY.
A.D. 1076 Tedaldo.	A.D. 1060 Siegfried 1084	A.D. 1068 Manns- ses I. 1093	A.D. 1070 Lanfranc 1089	A.D. 1088 Henry I. 1112	A.D. 1085 Robert Guiscard 1085	A.D. 1063 Solomon 1074
Anselm 1093	1084 Wezil 1088	1093 Rainald 1096	1093 Anselm.		1085 Roger I. (Sicily) 1111	1074 Geisa 1077
	1088 Ruthard 1108					1077 Ladislaus I. 1095
						1095 Koloman 1114

BOOK VII.



CHAPTER I.

HILDEBRAND.

HILDEBRAND was now Pope; the great contest for the dominion over the human mind, the strife between the temporal and spiritual power, which had been carried on for some centuries as a desultory and intermitting warfare, was now to be waged boldly, openly, implacably, to the subjugation of one or of the other. Sacerdotal, or rather Papal Christianity, had not yet fulfilled its mission, for, the Papal control withdrawn, the sacerdotal rule would have lost its unity, and with its unity its authority must have dissolved away. Without the clergy, not working here and there with irregular and uncombined excitement on the religious feelings of man, awakening in one quarter a vigorous enthusiasm, while in other parts of Europe men were left to fall back into some new Christian heathenism, or into an inert habitual Christianity of form; without the whole order laboring on a fixed and determined system, through creeds sanctified by ancient reverence, and a ceremonial guarded by rigid usage: without this vast uniform, hierarchical

Pope Gregory
VII.
April 22,
A.D. 1073.

influence, where, in those ages of anarchy and ignorance, of brute force and dormant intelligence, had been Christianity itself? And looking only to its temporal condition, what had the world been without Christianity?

The Papacy has still the more splendid part of its destiny to accomplish. It has shown The Papacy. vital power enough to recover from its seemingly irrecoverable degradation. It might have been supposed that a moral and religious depravation so profound, would utterly have destroyed that reverence of opinion, which was the one groundwork of the Papal power. The veil had been raised; and Italy at least, if not Europe, had seen within it, not a reflex of divine majesty and holiness, but an idol not only hideous to the pure moral sentiment, but contemptible for its weakness. If centuries of sanctity had planted deeply in the heart of man his veneration for the successor of St. Peter, it would have been paralyzed (the world might expect) and extinguished by more than a century of odious and unchristian vices. A spiritual succession must be broken and interrupted by such unspiritual inheritors. Could the head of Christendom, living in the most unchristian wickedness, perpetuate his descent, and hand down the patrimony of power and authority, with nothing of that piety and goodness which was at least one of his titles to that transcendant power?

But that idea or that opinion would not have endured for centuries, had it not possessed strength enough to reconcile its believers to contradictions and inconsistencies. With all the Teutonic part of Latin Christendom, the belief in the supremacy of the Pope was coeval with their Christianity; it was an article of their original creed as much as the Redemption; their

apostles were commissioned by the Pope ; to him they humbly looked for instruction and encouragement, even almost for permission to advance upon their sacred adventure. Augustine, Boniface, Ebbo, Anschar, had been papal missionaries. If the faith of Italy was shaken by too familiar a view of that which the Germans contemplated with more remote and indistinct veneration, the national pride, in Rome especially, accepted the spiritual as a compensation for the loss of the temporal supremacy ; it had ceased to be the centre of the Imperial—it would not endure not to be that of ecclesiastical dominion. The jealousy of a Pope elected, or even born, elsewhere than in Italy, showed the vitality of that belief in the Papacy, which was belied by so many acts of violence towards individual Popes. The religious minds would be chiefly offended by the incongruity between the lives and the station of the Pope ; but to them it would be a part of religion to suppress any rebellious doubts. Their souls were deeply impressed with the paramount necessity of the unity of the Church ; to them the Papacy was of divine appointment, the Pope the successor of St. Peter : all secret questioning of this integral part of their implanted faith was sin. However then they might bow down in shame and sorrow at the inscrutable decrees of Heaven, in allowing its Vicegerent thus to depart from his original brightness, yet they would veil their faces in awe, and await in trembling patience the solution of that mystery. In the Christian mind in general, or rather the mind within the world of Christendom, the separation between Christian faith and Christian morality was almost complete. Christianity was a mere unreasoning assent to certain dogmatic truths, an

unreasoning obedience to certain ceremonial observances. Controversy was almost dead. In the former century, the predestinarian doctrines of Gotschalk, in general so acceptable to the popular ear, had been entirely suppressed by the sacerdotal authority. The tenets of Berengar concerning the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, had been restrained, and were to be once more restrained, by the same strong hand; and Berengar's logic was beyond his age. The Manichean doctrines of the Paulicians and kindred sects were doubtless spreading to a great extent among the lower orders, but as yet in secrecy, breaking out now in one place, now in another, yet everywhere beheld with abhorrence, creating no wide alarm, threatening no dangerous disunion. In all the vulgar of Christendom (and that vulgar comprehended all orders, all ranks) the moral sentiment, as more obtuse, would be less shocked by that incongruity which grieved and oppressed the more religious. The great body of Christians in the West would no more have thought of discussing the character of the Pope, than the attributes of God. He was to them the apostle, the vicegerent of God, enveloped in the same kind of awful mystery. They feared the thunders of the Lateran as those of heaven; and were no more capable of sound discrimination as to the limits, grounds, and nature of that authority, than as to the causes of the destructive fire from the clouds. Their general belief in the judgment to come was not more deeply rooted than in the right of the clergy, more especially the head of the clergy, to anticipate, to declare, or to ratify their doom.

The German line of Pontiffs had done much to reinvest the Papacy in its ancient sanctity. The

Italian Alexander II. had been at least a blameless Pontiff; and now every qualification which could array the Pope in imposing majesty, in what bordered on divine worship, seemed to meet in Gregory VII.

Character. His life verified the splendid panegyric with which he had been presented by Cardinal Hugo to the Roman people. He had the austere virtue, the most simple piety, the fame of vast theologic knowledge, the tried ability to rule men, intrepidity which seemed to delight in confronting the most powerful; a stern singleness of purpose, which, under its name of Churchmanship, gave his partisans unlimited reliance on his firmness and resolution, and yet a subtle policy which bordered upon craft. To them his faults were virtues; his imperiousness the due assertion of his dignity; his unfounded ambition zeal in God's cause: no haughtiness could be above that which became his station. The terror by which he ruled (he was so powerful that he could dispense with love), as it was the attribute of the Divinity now exclusively worshipped by man, so was it that which became the representative of God on earth.

Hildebrand, if not a Roman by birth, was an adopted Roman by education. He was of humble origin; so humble as to be obscure, almost doubtful. His father was a carpenter in Saona, a small town on the southern border of Tuscany. His name implies a Teutonic descent, though later adulation allied it with the great Roman house, the Aldobrandini. His later glory, as usual, cast back a preternatural splendor on his early life: prognostics of his future greatness began to embellish the dark years of his infancy and youth. His youth was passed in a monastic house in Rome, St. Mary on the Aven-

Birth and
youth of
Hildebrand.

tine, of which his uncle was abbot. That Abbot, named Lawrence, if the same who was afterwards Archbishop of Amalfi, was a man of ability and reputation. The disposition of Hildebrand was congenial to his education. He was a monk from his boyhood. Mortification in the smallest things taught him that self-command and rigor which he was afterwards to enforce on himself and on mankind: it was his self-imposed discipline, perhaps his pride, to triumph over every indulgence of the senses, even on the most trivial occasions. His sternness to others was that which throughout life he exercised upon himself.

Rome was no favorable school for monastic perfection; yet perhaps the gross and revolting licentiousness of the city, and the abuses in the monastic system, which whether they had penetrated or not into the sanctuary on the Aventine, by exciting the abhorrence of the devout Hildebrand may have hardened his austerity. The alternative to a Roman monk was between shameless profligacy and the extremest rigor, and Hildebrand would not be outdone in the holier course. But arrived at manhood, he determined to seek some better school for his ardent devotion, and to suppress, by travel and by study in some more safe retreat, the yet mutinous passions of his adolescence. There were still, in the general degeneracy of the monastic institutes, some renowned for their sanctity. At no period have been wanting men, who carried out to the utmost, who aimed at surpassing, the severe rules of Benedict or Columban. Among these was Odilo, abbot of Clugny, in Burgundy, the great Reformer of the monastic life in France. The situation of this monastery was beautiful.

Hildebrand
in Clugny

Hildebrand here found a retreat among brethren, whose asceticism might test his most rigorous power of self-discipline. The studies which he had commenced with promising success at Rome, proceeded rapidly in the peaceful shades of Clugny. Hildebrand soon became master of all the knowledge of the times ; and, perhaps at no period was in greater danger of abandoning the lofty destiny for which he seemed born. Where there was such depth of devotion there must have been strong temptation to remain, and to permit that devotion to luxuriate undisturbed and uninterrupted. Hildebrand might have been content to live and die the successor of Odilo of Clugny, not of the long line of Roman Pontiffs.

But holy retirement was not the vocation of his busy and energetic spirit. Hildebrand is again in Rome ; he is attached to that one of three conflicting Popes, whose cause would doubtless have been espoused by a man of devout feeling, and rigidly attached to canonical order. When Gregory VI., compelled to abdicate the
A.D. 1047. Papacy, retired into Germany, he was followed by Hildebrand ; on Gregory's death Hildebrand returned for a short time to his beloved retreat at Clugny.

But during all this period, as a resident in France and in Germany, he was acquiring that knowledge of men and of affairs, which he was hereafter to employ in his great scheme of dominant churchmanship. It was the Italian and the Churchman surveying the weakness of the enemy's position. From Clugny he emerged,
A.D. 1048. having cast his spell on the congenial mind of Leo IX., and admonished him to maintain the dignity and independence of the Papal election. From this

time he was Pope, or becoming so. On every great occasion he was the legate: he was commissioned to encounter and suppress the daring Berengar; he was, no doubt, the adviser of Nicolas II. in the change of the Roman policy, the assumption of the power of election by the Cardinals, and the Norman alliance. He created Alexander II., and discomfited his rival, Cadalous. The strongest indication, indeed, of his superiority, his prophetic consciousness of his own coming greatness, was the self-command with which he controlled his own ambition. There was no eager or premature struggle for advancement; offices, honors, laid themselves at his feet. He was content to labor in a subordinate capacity, to have the substance without the pomp of authority, the influence without the dignity of the Papal power. For a long period in the Papal annals, Hildebrand alone seems permanent. Pope after Pope dies, disappears; Hildebrand still stands unmoved, or is rising more and more to eminence. The Italian might even seem to trust, not without stern satisfaction, to the fatal climate of his country, to wear out the rapid succession of German pontiffs, who yet were rendering the great service of regenerating the Popedom. One by one they fall off, Clement, Damasus, Leo, Victor, Nicolas. The only one who rules for ten years is the Italian, Alexander II.

While Hildebrand was thus rising to the height of power, and becoming more and more immersed in the affairs of the world, which he was to rule, his Damiani, aged colleague in one of his important missions, the suppression of the married clergy in Lombardy, Peter Damiani beheld his progress with amazement, with friendly terror and regret. The similitude and contrast

between these two men is truly characteristic of the age. Damiani was still a monk at heart ; he had been compelled by Pope Stephen, his persecutor, as he called him, rather than his patron, to take upon him the episcopate. He had been invested by the same gentle violence in the rank of a Cardinal ; and in that character had wrought his temporary triumph in Milan. Already had he addressed an earnest argument to Pope Nicolas II., to be allowed to abdicate the weary, unthankful, unmonastic office. Damiani saw the monk, in all but its personal austerity, departing from the character of Hildebrand. Hildebrand could not comprehend the pusillanimity, and, as it were, spiritual selfishness with which Damiani, in anxious apprehension for his own soul, would withdraw from the world, which himself would confront and cope with, not seek his safety in cowardly flight. Damiani trembled even for the stern virtue of Hildebrand, when raised to the pomp, and at least able to command the luxuries of a magnificent prelate. His argument is a bitter satire against the Bishops, and, of course, the still loftier dignitaries of the Church. "What would the bishops of old have done, had they to endure the torments which now attend the episcopate ? To ride forth constantly attended by troops of soldiers, with swords and lances ; to be girt about with armed men, like a heathen general ! Not amid the gentle music of hymns, but the din and clash of arms ! Every day royal banquets, every day parade ! The table, loaded with delicacies, not for the poor, but for voluptuous guests ; while the poor, to whom the property of right belongs, are shut out, and pine away with famine."¹

¹ In one passage Damiani declares no single clerk fit to be a bishop ; one

From that time Gregory and Damiani trod their opposite paths: Damiani to subdue the world within himself¹ with more utter aversion, more concentrated determination; Hildebrand to subdue the world without — how far within his own heart God alone may judge.

The first, the avowed object of Gregory's pontificate, was the absolute-independence of the clergy, of the Pope, of the great prelates throughout Latin Christendom, down to the lowest functionary, whose person was to become sacred; that independence under which lurked the undisguised pretension to superior-^{Views of Hildebrand.}ity. His remote and somewhat more indistinct vision, was the foundation of a vast spiritual autocracy in the person of the Pope, who was to rule mankind by the consentient, but subordinate authority of the clergy throughout the world. For this end the clergy were to become still more completely a separate, inviolable caste; their property equally sacred with their persons. Each in his separate sphere, the Pope above all and comprehending all, was to be sovereign arbiter of all disputes; to hold in his hands the supreme mediation in questions of war and peace; to adjudge contested successions to kingdoms; to be a great feudal lord, to whom other kings became Beneficiaries. His own arms were to be chiefly spiritual, but the temporal power was to be always ready to execute the ecclesiastical behest against the ungodly rebels who might revolt from its authority; nor did the Churchman refuse altogether to use secular

is a little better (*meliusculum*) than another. The Bishop of Fano he calls "*latro Fanensis*." — *Opuscul.*

¹ See Damiani's black account of the sins which he had to struggle against. Those which clung to him were scurrility (Damiani was not wanting in self-knowledge) and *disposition to laughter*. — *Epist.* v. 2.

weapons, to employ armies in its own name, or even to permit the use of arms to the priesthood.

For this complete isolation of the hierarchy into a peculiar and inviolable caste was first necessary the reformation of the clergy in two most important preliminary matters; the absolute extirpation of the two evils, which the more rigid churchmen had been denouncing for centuries, to the suppression of which Hildebrand had devoted so much of his active energies. The war against simony and the concubinage of the clergy (for under this ill-sounding name was condemned all connection, however legalized, with the female sex), must first be carried to a triumphant issue, before the Church could assume its full and uncontested domination.

Like his predecessors, like all the more high-minded Churchmen, Hildebrand refused to see that simony was the inevitable consequence of the inordinate wealth of the clergy. It was a wild moral paradox to attempt to reconcile enormous temporal possessions and enormous temporal power, with the extinction of all temporal motives for obtaining, all temptations to the misuse of, these all-envied treasures. Religion might at first beguile itself into rapacity, on account of the sacred and beneficent uses to which it designed to devote wealth and power. Works of piety and charity might, for a short time, with the sacred few, be the sole contemplated, sole sought object. But rapacity would soon throw off the mask and assume its real character. Personal passions and desires would intrude into the holiest sanctuary. Pious works would become secondary, subordinate, till at last they would vanish from the view; ambition, avarice, pride, prodigality, luxury, would, by

degrees, supplant those rare and singular virtues. The clergy had too much power over public opinion themselves to submit to its control ; they awed mankind — were under awe to none. In the feudal system, which had been so long growing up throughout Western Europe, bishops had become, in every respect, the equals of the secular nobles. In every city the bishop, if not the very first of men, was on a level with the first : without the city he was lord of the amplest domains. Archbishops almost equalled kings ; for who would not have coveted the station and authority of a Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, rather than that of the feeble Carlovingian monarch ? The citizen might well be jealous of the superior opulence and influence of the priest ; even the rustic, the serf, might behold, not without envy, his son or his brother (for from this sacerdotal caste there was no absolute exclusion either in theory or practice of the meanest) enjoying the security, the immunities, the respect paid even to the most humble orders of the clergy. And so it was throughout the whole framework of society. But if this was the nobler part of the democratic constitution of the Church, that it was a caste not of birth or race, it had its countervailing evils. There was a constant temptation ; a temptation growing in proportion to its privileges and immunities ; a temptation which overleaped, or trampled down every barrier, to enter the Church from unhallowed motives. The few who assumed the sacred office from high and pure and perfectly religious views, became comparatively fewer. Men crowded into it from all quarters, and seized at once on its highest and its almost menial offices. That which had been obtained by unworthy means, or for

unworthy motives, would be employed for no higher ends. We have seen the Barbarians forcing their way into the sacred ranks, and bringing with them much of their barbarity. Charlemagne himself had set the example of advancing his natural sons to high ecclesiastical dignities. His feebler descendants, even the more pious, submitted to the same course from choice or necessity. The evil worked downwards. The Bishop, who had bought his see, indemnified himself by selling the inferior prebends or cures. What was so intrinsically valuable began to have its money-price ; it became an object of barter and sale. The layman who purchased holy orders bought usually peace, security of life, comparative ease. Those who aspired to higher dignities soon repaid themselves for the outlay, however large and extortionate. For several centuries, Pope after Pope, Council after Council, had continued to denounce this crime, this almost heresy. The iteration, the gradually increasing terrors of their anathemas, show their inefficacy. While the ambitious churchmen on the one hand were laboring to suppress it, by the still accumulating accessions to their power and wealth they were aggravating the evil. At this period, not merely the indignant satire of the more austere, but graver history and historical poetry, even the acts and decrees of Councils declare that, from the Papacy down to the lowest parochial cure, every spiritual dignity and function was venal. The highest bishops confessed their own guilt ; the bishopric of Rome had too often been notoriously bought and sold. Sometimes, indeed, but not always, it condescended to some show of decency. Simony might veil itself under the appearance of ordinary and ancient usage. The universal feudal practice

of making offerings to the sovereign, or to the liege lord, or even largesses to the people, at every act of promotion, grant, or enfranchisement, might seem to justify these donations, at first honorary and voluntary, at length exacted as a tribute, with unscrupulous rapacity. With this was connected the whole famous question of investiture.

But however disguised, simony from its odious name was acknowledged to be a crime and a sin.¹ It undermined the power and authority of the clergy. The priest or bishop laboring under this imputation was held up, by the decrees of Popes and Councils, as an object of hatred and contempt, rather than of respect. But beyond this the vast possessions which tempted to simony were endangered by its inevitable consequences. While the clergy were constantly working on the fears of men to increase their own wealth, the only reprisal in the power of the laity was through the venality of the clergy. It was their only means of rescuing some part of their property from the all absorbing cupidity of those who made it their duty to secure, in theory for God and for pious uses, but too often for other ends, very large proportions of the land throughout Latin Christendom. According to the strict law, the clergy could receive every thing, alienate nothing. But the frequent and bitter complaints of the violent usurpation, or the fraudulent alienation by the clergy themselves,

¹ Tedaldo, Bishop of Arezzo, so detested simony, that he would have become a simoniac Pope himself to root out the sin; at least, so says Donizo, the panegyrist of the Countess Matilda:—

“ Ipsos detestans dicebat mente modestâ
Mille libras certè pro Papatu dare vellem.
Ut quod ego glisco simoniacos maledictos
Ejicerem cunctos per totum denique mundum.” — i. 5.

of what had been church property, show that neither party respected this sanctity when it was the interest of both to violate it.¹ While, on the one hand, the clergy extorted from the dying prince or noble some important grant, immunity or possession, the despoiled heir would scruple at no means of resuming his alienated rights or property. The careless, the profligate, the venal, the warlike bishop or abbot, would find means, if he found advantage, to elude the law ; to surrender gradually and imperceptibly ; to lease out the land so as to annihilate its value to the Church ; to grant in perpetuity for trifling compensations or for valueless service, the coveted estate ; and so to relax the inexorable grasp of the Church. His own pomp and expenditure would reduce the ecclesiastic to the wants and subterfuges of debtors and of bankrupts ; and so the estates would, directly or circuitously, return either to the original or to some new owner.

With this universal simony was connected, more closely than may at first appear, the other great vice of the age, as it was esteemed by Hildebrand and his school, the marriage of the clergy. Few of these men, actuated only by religious motives, by the stern, dominant spirit of monasticism in their refusal of this indulgence to religious men, may have had the sagacity to discern the real danger arising to their power from this practice. The celibacy of the clergy was necessary to their existence, at the present period as a separate

¹ Muratori describes well this struggle: "*Metebant jugi labore in sæcularium campis clerici, ac præcipue monachi; vicissim vero et sæculares nihil intentatum relinquebant, ut messem ab ecclesiasticis congestam, in horrea sua leviori interdum negotio deducerent. Propterea quamvis universam pene tellurem absorbere posse ac velle videretur cleri utriusque industria, plura sacris locis erepta quam relictæ fuisse.*" — *Ant. It. Diss. lxxxii.*

caste. The clergy, in an advanced period of civilization, may sink into ordinary citizens ; they may become a class of men discharging the common functions of life, only under a stronger restraint of character and of public opinion. As examples of the domestic, as of the other virtues ; as training up families in sound morals and religion, they are of inappreciable advantage ; they are a living remonstrance and protest against that licentiousness of manners which is the common evil of more refined society. But the clergy of this age, necessarily a caste, would have degenerated from an open, unexclusive caste, to a close and hereditary one.¹ Under the feudal system, every thing, from the throne to the meanest trade, had a hereditary tendency. The benefices, originally revocable at the will of the liege lord, were becoming patrimonies ; rank, station, distinction, descended from father to son : the guilds, if they were beginning to be formed in towns, were likewise hereditary. The son followed the trade, and succeeded to the tools, the skill of his parent. But hereditary succession once introduced into the Church, the degeneracy of the order was inevitable ; the title to its high places, at least, and its emoluments, would have become more and more exclusive : her great men would cease to rise from all ranks and all quarters.²

¹ See in Damiani a frightful story of a bishop in Marsia, who had a son by a concubine, whom he substituted for himself in his bishopric. He himself coveted the monastery of Casino, hired assassins to pluck out the abbot's eyes, and send the reeking proofs of the murder to him. He died, however, suddenly, at the moment that the abbot was being blinded. True or false, Damiani believed the story. — Epist. iv. 8.

² "*Ampla itaque prædia, ampla patrimonia, et quæcunque bona possunt, de bonis ecclesiæ, neque enim aliunde habent, infames patres infamibus filiis acquirunt. Et ut liberi non per rapinam appareant, volunt enim in terrâ rapere libertatem, ut diabolus in cælo voluit deitatem, in militiam eos mox faciunt transire nobilium.*" — Concil. Papiens. A.D. 1022. Mansi, xix.;

Hereditary succession, we have said, and the degeneracy of the order were inseparable. Great as were the evils inevitable from the dominion of the priesthood, if it had become in any degree the privilege of certain families, that evil would have been enormously aggravated; the compensating advantages annulled. Family affections and interests would have been constantly struggling against those of the Church. Selfishness, under its least unamiable form, would have been ever counteracting the lofty and disinterested spirit which still actuated the better Churchmen; one universal nepotism — a nepotism not of kindred but of parentage — would have preyed upon the vital energies of the order. Every irreligious occupant would either have endeavored to alienate to his lay descendants the property of the Church, or bred up his still more degenerate descendants in the certainty of succession to their patrimonial benefice.¹

Pertz, *Leg.* ii. 561. Compare Theiner, i. 457. It was prohibited, but vainly prohibited, to receive the sons of priests into orders. Gerhard, Bishop of Lorch, asks Pope Leo VII. whether it was lawful: the Pope decided that the sons must not bear the sins of their fathers. — Labbe, ix., sub. an. 937. Compare Planck, iii. p. 601.

¹ RATHERIUS of Verona, a century earlier (he died 974), declaims against this hereditary priesthood. He had already asserted, "*Quam perdita tonsuratorum universitas tota, ut nemo in eis qui non aut adulter aut sit arse-noquita. Adulter enim nobis est, qui contra canones uxorius est.*" He declares that there were priests and deacons not only bigami, but trigami et quadrigami. "*Presbyter vero aut diaconus uxorem legitimam non possit habere. Si filium de ipsâ fornicatione, vel quod pejus est, adulterio, genitum facit presbyterum, ille iterum suum, suum alter iterum; pullulans illud usque in finem sæculi taliter adulterium, cujus est, nisi illius qui illud primitus seminavit? Quocirca monendi et obsecrandi fratres, ut quia prohiberi, proh dolor! a mulieribus valetis nullo modo, filios de vobis generatos dimitteretis saltem esse laicos, filias laicis jungeretis, ut vel in fine saltem vestro terminaretur, et nusquam in finem sæculi duraret adulterium vestrum.*" — *De Nuptu* ejusdam illicito, ap. d'Achery, i. pp. 370, 1. The Synod of Worms thus writes of the object of Hildebrand's law: "*Causa*

Yet celibacy may be the voluntary self-sacrifice of an individual, it may be maintained for a time by mutual control and awe; by severe discipline; by a strong corporate spirit in a monastic community. But in a low state of morals as to sexual intercourse, in an order recruited from all classes of society, not filled by men of tried and matured religion; in an order crowded by aspirants after its wealth, power, comparative ease, privileges, immunities, public estimation; in an order superior to, or dictating public opinion (if public opinion made itself heard); in a permanent order, in which the degeneracy of one age would go on increasing in the next, till it produced some stern reaction; in an order comparatively idle, without social duties or intellectual pursuits; in an order not secluded in the desert, but officially brought into the closest and most confidential relations as instructors and advisers of the other sex, it was impossible to maintain real celibacy;¹ and the

legis est, ne ecclesiarum opes collectæ per sacerdotum matrimonia et liberos rursus diffuerent." The same complaints are made in England as late as the reign of Henry II. (Epist. Gul. Folliott, 361-362). So little effect had the measures of Gregory and his successors, that Folliott excuses Pope Alexander III. for not carrying out the law: "*Si vero prorsus vitium extirpatum non est, id non imputandum sibi sed magis delinquentium multitudini, vixque, vel nunquam, abolendæ consuetudini.*" — Document Hist. apud Giles, vol. ii. p. 237.

¹ It is impossible entirely to suppress all notice of other evils which arose out of, and could not but arise out of the enforced celibacy of the clergy, a barbarous clergy, an unmarried clergy, not, throughout the order, under the very strong control of a vigilant and fearless public opinion. Damiani's odious book has been already named; its name is enough. Damiani saw not that, by his own measures, he was probably making such a book almost necessary in future times. In the Council of Metz, 898, a stronger prohibition is needed than against wives and concubines. "*Nequaquam in sua domo secum aliquam fæminam habeant, nec matrem, nec sororem; sed auferentes omnem occasionem Satanæ . . .*" — Can. v. That of Nantes gives more plainly the cause of the prohibition: "*Quia instigante diabolo, etiam in illis scelus frequenter perpetratum reperitur, aut etiam in pedisequis illorum, scilicet matrem, amitam, sororem.*" A.D. 895.

practical alternative lay between secret marriage, concubinage without the form of marriage, or a looser and more corrupting intercourse between the sexes.

Throughout Latin Christendom, throughout the whole spiritual realm of Hildebrand, he could not but know there had been long a deep-murmured, if not an avowed doubt, as to the authority of the prohibitions against the marriage of the clergy; where the dogmatic authority of the Papal canons was not called in question, there was a bold resistance, or a tacit infringement of the law. Italy has been seen in actual, if uncombined, rebellion from Calabria to the Alps. The whole clergy of the kingdom of Naples has appeared, under Married clergy in Italy. Nicolas II., from the highest to the lowest, openly living with their lawful wives. Still earlier, we have seen Leo IX. contesting, and it should seem in vain, this undisguised license in Rome itself.¹ Milan and other Lombard cities, and Florence, had withstood authority, eloquence, popular violence, even the tribunitian fury of ecclesiastical demagogues; they were silenced, but neither convinced nor subdued. The married clergy were still, if for the present cowed, a powerful faction throughout Italy; they were awaiting their time of vengeance.² Ravenna, if she had now

¹ See quotation, vol. iii. p. 302, from Gulielmus Appulus. See pp. 486-510, with quotations from Peter Damiani and the biographer of S. Gualberto.

² The best testimony for the whole of Italy, including Rome (even beyond the declamations of Damiani), is the statement of the more sober Pope Victor in his Dialogues. "Itaque cum vulgus clericorum per viam effrænatae licentiæ, nemine prohibente, graderetur, cœperunt ipsi presbyteri et diacones (qui tradita sibi sacramenta Dominica mundo corde castoque corpore tractare debebant), laicorum more uxores ducere susceptosque filios hæredes relinquere. Nonnulli etiam episcoporum, verecundiâ omni contemptâ, cum uxoribus domo simul in unâ habitare. Et hæc pessima et execranda consuetudo intra Urbem maximè pullulabat, unde olim relig-

fallen into comparative obscurity, and was not, as far as appears, so deeply committed in the strife, yet preserved in her annals (perhaps from the days of her Greek Exarchate) the memory of saintly prelates who had asserted the right of marriage.¹ The memory of the married Pope, Hadrian II., was but recent.

In Germany the power and influence of the married clergy will make itself felt, if less openly proclaimed, as a bond of alliance with the Emperor and the Lombard prelates. The famous letter of Ulric, bishop of Augsburg, to Pope Nicolas I.,² had already boldly asserted the Teutonic freedom in this great question. Ulric had urged with great force the moral and scriptural arguments; and sternly contrasted the vices of the unmarried with the virtues of the married clergy. Adelbert, the magnificent Archbishop of Bremen, almost conceded the marriage of the clergy to avoid worse evils; the statesman prevailed

ionis norma ab ipso Apostolo Petro ejusque successoribus ubique diffusa processerat." — Max. Biblioth. Patr. xviii. Compare Bonizo apud (Efel. Rer. Boic. Script. ii. 799.

¹ Compare Agnelli, Vit. Pontif. Ravennat. "Sed quærendum nobis est cur iste conjugatus talem egregiam obtinuit sedem. Si intelligatis auctorem Apostolum dicentem, unius uxoris virum, et filios habentem, episcopos ordinari recte providetur, cum et hoc Canones præceperint." — p. 113. Saint Severus was married, when Archbishop of Ravenna, according to a life written about this time. "Sicut enim ciborum edulio non polluitur homo, nisi insidiatrix concupiscentia præcedit, sic quoque legali conjugio non inquinatur Christianus, qui se nullatenus vel virginitatis vel continentie alligavit." — Compare p. 192, where the example of Peter is alleged. The saint abstained when archbishop. — Ibid., p. 189.

² Apud Eccard, Hist. Med. Ævi, ii. p. 26. I see no just grounds to doubt the authenticity of this letter, though it contains a very foolish story. Compare Shroeck, xxii. p. 533. "Quid divinæ maledictioni obligatius, quam cum aliqui eorum episcopi videlicet et archidiaconi ita præcípites sint in libidine, ut neque adulteria, neque incestus, neque masculorum, pro pudor! sciant abhorre concubitus, quod casta clericorum conjugia dicunt fœtere." Some assert this letter to be a forgery of this period.

over the prelate.¹ Gregory himself had to rebuke the Archbishop of Saltzburg for his remissness in not correcting the uncleanness of his clergy (a phrase which may be safely interpreted, not separating them from their wives), the Bishop of Constance for being indulgent to such flagitious courses.²

Among the detested and incorrigible offences which drove Saint Adalbert in indignation from his bishopric of Prague, were the marriage of the clergy, and the polygamy of the laity.³

There is no reason to suppose the marriage of the clergy less common in France, though it had either the good fortune, or the prudence, not to come into such bold and open collision with the stern Reformer. The French councils denounce the crime as frequent, notorious. That of Bourges had threatened to deprive the married priests, deacons, and subdeacons, if they did not give up all connexion with their wives or concubines.⁴ Under Gregory VII. the Bishop of Toul is accused, it is true, by a refractory clerk, of living publicly with a concubine, by whom he had a son.⁵

In Normandy — if there were priests so early of Norman descent — the fierceness of the conqueror, the Teutonic independence; if the priesthood

¹ "Audivimus cum sæpenumero Adelbertus clerum suum de continentia hortaretur, Admoneo vos, inquit, et postulans jubeo, ut pestiferis mulierum vinculis absolvamini, aut si ad hoc non potestis cogi, saltem cum verecundia vinculum matrimonii custodite, secundum illud quod dicitur, Si non castè tamen cautè." — Scolast. in Adam. Brem. iii. 32, apud Lindenbrog, p. 41.

² Regest. i. 30, Nov. 15, 1073, and Udalric Bab. apud Eccard. "Quod pœnam libidinis laxaverit, ut qui mulierculis se inquinaverint in flagitio persisterent." — Dec. 1074.

³ In 990. Cosmas Pragensis, v. S. Adalbert, p. 77.

⁴ Canon. v.

⁵ Regest. ii. 10.

were of the old Frankish race, the long years of anarchy, had broken down or so dissolved all the old bonds of law and order, that even bishops openly lived with their wives, and sate proudly in the midst of their sons and daughters.¹ When Herluin, the founder of the monastery of Bec, betook himself to monastic life, an unmarried priest or bishop was hardly to be found in Normandy. Leo IX., as has been seen, in vain denounced, at his council at Rheims, the martial and married prelates. They gave up reluctantly their arms; nothing would induce them to yield their wives. The Archbishop of Rouen daring, in a public synod, to prohibit under anathema the priests to retain those whom he opprobriously called their concubines, was overwhelmed with a shower of stones, and driven out of the Church.

Among the Anglo-Saxon clergy before Dunstan, marriage was rather the rule, celibacy the exception.² In older Anglo-Saxon Britain monasticism itself had but seldom aspired either to the dreamy quietude of the

¹ "Tunc quippe in Neustriâ post adventum Normannorum, in tantum dissoluta erat castitas clericorum, ut non solum presbyteri sed etiam præsules libere uterentur thoris concubinarum, et palam superbirent multiplici propagine filiorum et filiarum. Tunc ibidem (Remis) generale concilium tenuit (Leo IX.) et inter reliqua ecclesiæ commoda, quæ constituit, presbyteris arma ferre et conjuges habere prohibuit. Exinde consuetudo lethalis paulatim exinaniri cœpit. Arma quidem ferre presbyteri jam patienter desiere; sed a pellicibus *adhuc nolunt* abstinere, nec pudicitiae inservire." — Orderic. Vital., apud Duchesne, p. 372. "Rarus in Normanniâ tunc rectæ tramitis aut index aut præviis erat: sacerdotes et summi pontifices *libere conjugati*, et arma portantes, ut laici." — Vit. S. Herluin. apud Lanfranc. Oper., p. 263. "Multum contra impudicos presbyteros pro auferendis pellicibus laboravit, a quibus dum in synodo concubinas eis sub anathema prohiberet, lapidibus percussus aufugit, fugiensque ab ecclesiâ, 'Deus, venerunt gentes in hæreditatem tuam,' fortiter clamavit." — Orderic. Vital., A.D. 1069-1079.

² Kemble, ii. pp. 441-471.

East, or the passionate and excessive austerity of the West: it was a religious profession, no more. The monks attached to most of the cathedrals lived under a kind of canonical rule, but were almost universally married. In the richer conventual foundations ruled mostly, as in France, noble and warlike abbots, and noble abbesses; they took no vow of chastity; they married or remained unmarried at their will.¹ The only two true monks were the Benedictines, who had been introduced by Archbishop Wilfrid. They were chiefly in the northern kingdoms, but throughout England these monasteries had been mercilessly wasted by the Danes: a white cowl was as rare as a ghost. When Dunstan began his career there were true monks only at Abingdon and Glastonbury.²

An English historian may be permitted to dwell in England. somewhat more at length on this great question in Anglo-Saxon Britain. A century before Gregory VII., the Primate Odo, and after him Dunstan, had devoted themselves to work that which they too Dunstan. deemed a holy revolution. Dunstan's life was a crusade, a cruel, unrelenting, yet but partially successful crusade against the married clergy, which in truth comprehended the whole secular clergy of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom. Dunstan was, as it were, in a narrower sphere, among a ruder people, a prophetic type and harbinger of Hildebrand. Like Hildebrand,

¹ "Monasteria nempe Angliæ ante Reformationem a Dunstano et Edgare rege institutam, totidem erant conventus clericorum sæcularium; qui amplissimis possessionibus dotati et certis sibi invicem regulis astricti, officia sua in ecclesiis quotidie frequentarunt; omnibus interim aliorum clericorum privilegiis, atque ipsâ uxores ducendi licentiâ gaudebant." — Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, i. p. 218.

² Theiner, p. 530.

or rather like Damiani doing the work of Hildebrand, in the spirit, not of a rival sovereign, but of an iron-hearted monk, he trampled the royal power under his feet. The scene at the coronation of King Edwy, excepting the horrible cruelties to which it was the prelude, and which belong to a more barbarous race, might seem to prepare mankind for the humiliation of the Emperor Henry at Canosa.

Archbishop Odo was the primary author, Dunstan the agent, in the outrage on the royal authority at the coronation of young Edwy. Odo was a Dane; had been a warrior: in him the conquering Dane and the stern warrior mingled with the imperious churchman.¹ Dunstan not from his infancy, but from his youth, had been self-trained as a monk. In Dunstan were moulded together the asceticism almost of an Eastern anchorite (his cell would hardly give free room for his body, yet his cell was not only his dwelling, it was his workshop and forge), with some of the industry and accomplishments of a Benedictine. He wrought in iron, in ivory, in the precious metals; practised some arts of design; it is said that he copied manuscripts. Odo became Primate of England. Dunstan at first refused a bishopric: he was Abbot of Glastonbury. The admiring, the worshipping monkish biographers of Dunstan, while they have labored to heighten him to the glory of a saint, have unconsciously darkened him into one of the most odious of mankind. Their panegyric and their undesigned calumny must be received with doubt and

¹ Among the constitutions of Archbishop Odo was the emphatic one: —“*Ammonemus regem et principes et omnes qui in potestate sunt ut cum magnâ reverentiâ Archiepiscopo et omnibus aliis episcopis obediant.*” — Const. ii., Wilkins, sub ann. 943. “*Nec alicui liceat censum ponere super ecclesiam Dei.*”

reservation. Among the perpetual miracles with which they have invested his whole career, some are so awkwardly imagined as to suggest to the most candid an inevitable suspicion of fraud.

With them it was holy zeal (and zeal it doubtless was, how far leavened with harshness and pride who shall know?) which sent Dunstan, at the Primate's order, to drag forth the boy monarch of sixteen from the arms of his wife, back into the banquet-hall of his nobles, who were said to have held themselves insulted by his early withdrawal from their boisterous conviviality. The searing the face of the beautiful Elgiva with a red-hot iron, on her return from her exile in all her beauty and influence; the ham-stringing the unhappy woman; the premature death of Edwy, are related, not merely without compassion, but with a kind of savage triumph, by men in whose hearts not only the affections, but the humanity of our nature have been crushed out by their stern discipline.¹

The scene at Calne, when the great question between the monastic and secular clergy, it might almost be said the celibate and married clergy, was on the issue before the great national council; when the whole of the seats filled by the adverse party fell with a crash, and buried many of them in the ruins, was so happily timed, that although it might have been fortuitous (with the monks

¹ Even in our own day the sympathies of such a man as Dr. Lingard are not with the victims, but with the churchmen. He labors to show that Elgiva was not a wife, but a concubine (she was connected probably with Edwy by some remote kindred). He relates as undoubted truth the monstrous charge, adduced by the gross imagination of the monkish party, of the criminal intimacy of the boy with the mother as well as the daughter. Mr. Hallam has weighed and summed up (in one of his Supplemental Notes) with his usual rigid candor, all the probabilities — they are hardly more — of this dark transaction.

of course it was providential, miraculous), it is difficult not to remember Dunstan's mastery over all the mechanical skill of the day.¹

But, whatever the apparent triumph of Dunstan and of monasticism, it needed all the power of Odo the Primate, all the commanding perseverance of Dunstan, when the King Edgar, who now held the throne, became the slave of their will, and the royal laws and royal authority might seem to have no aim but the proscription of the marriage of the clergy² to obtain even transient conformity. It was not by law, but by armed invasion of cathedral after cathedral, that the married clergy were ejected, the Benedictines installed in their places. Twice the seculars had influence enough to prevent the elevation of Dunstan: his pious ambition at last condescended to a bishopric, that of Worcester, then of Worcester and London together, finally to the Primacy. Dunstan welcomed, so said his admirers, by visible angels, died; Dunstan wrought countless miracles at his tomb. Dunstan became a Saint; and yet he A.D. 988. had achieved no permanent victory. Hardly twenty years after the death of Dunstan, a council is held at

¹ "Omnibus ad terram elisis, solus Dunstanus, stans super unam trabem quæ superstes erat, probè evasit." Compare Osbern, in Vit. Dunstani. "Hoc miraculum archiepiscopo exhibuit pacem de clericis, omnibus Anglis tunc et deinceps in sententiam ejus concedentibus." — Gul. Malmesb., p. 258.

² Compare Edgar's *Charta de Oswald's Lawe*, A. D. 964. "Hoc est de ejiciendis clericis uxoratis et introducendis monachis." — Ap. Harduin, vi. p. 637. Malmesbury writes of Edgar like a true monk. It was a glorious reign of sixteen years. Nec ullus fere annus in chronicis præteritus est, quo non magnum et necessarium patriæ aliquid fecerit, quo non monasticum novum fundaverit. p. 236. — Edit. Hist. Society. See p. 237 on Dunstan, note, and on Dunstan's turning the secular priests of Worcester into regular. Tunc ordo monasticus jamdudum lapsus, præcipue caput erexit. p. 247.

Enham ; it declares that there were clergy who had two, even more wives ; some had dismissed their wives, and in their lifetime taken others. It might seem that the compulsory breach of the marriage bond had only introduced a looser, promiscuous concubinage ; men who strove, or were forced, to obey, returned to their conjugal habits with some new consort.¹

Canute, the Dane, aspired to be a religious monarch ; his laws are in the tone of the monastic hierarchy.

After the great revolution, which dispossessed the Saxon clergy of all the higher benefices, the Bishop of Lichfield is accused before the Papal legate, of living in open wedlock and with sons by his wife.² Archbishop Lanfranc is commanded, by Pope Gregory, to prohibit canons from taking wives ; and if priests and deacons, to part them immediately from their wives, or to inflict the sentence of deprivation.³

The strife throughout Christendom between the monks and the secular clergy, if it rose not directly out of, was closely connected with, this controversy. In the monks the severer ecclesiastics had sure allies ; they were themselves mostly monks : nearly all the great champions of the Church, the more intrepid vindicators of her immunities, the rigid administrators of her laws, were trained in the monasteries for their arduous conflict. It was an arduous, but against the married clergy, an unequal contest. The monastic

Monks and
secular
clergy.

¹ A. D. 1009. In *more* est, ut quidam duas, quidam plures habeant, et nonnullus quamvis eam dimiserit, quam antea habuit, aliam tamen ipsa vivente accipit. This, although "certissime norint quod non debeant habere ob aliquam coitus causam" uxoris consortium, the latter offence is "quod nullus Christianus facere debet." — Mansi, xxi. Wilkins, i. 287.

² Cui uxor publicè habita, filiiq; procreati testimonium perhibent. — Lanfranc. Epist. iv.

³ Regesta, Greg. vii. i. 30.

school were united, determined, under strong convictions, with undoubting confidence in broad and intelligible principles; the married clergy in general doubtful, vascillating, mostly full of misgiving as to the righteousness of their own cause; content with the furtive and permissive license, rather than disposed to claim it boldly as their inalienable right. The former had all the prejudices of centuries in their favor, the greatest names in the Church, long usage, positive laws, decrees of Popes, axioms of the most venerable fathers, some seemingly positive texts of Scripture: the latter only a vague appeal to an earlier antiquity with which they were little acquainted; the true sense of many passages of the sacred writings which had been explained away; a dangerous connection with suspicious or heretic alnames; the partial sanction of the unauthoritative Greek Church. Their strongest popular ground was the false charge of Manicheism against the adversaries of marriage.

The great strength of the monastic party was in the revival of monasticism itself. This had taken place, more or less, in almost every part of Christendom. The great monasteries had sunk on account of their vast possessions — too tempting to maintain respect — some into patrimonies of noble families — some into appanages, as it were, of the crown. The kings granted them to favorites, not always ecclesiastical favorites. Many were held by lay abbots, who, by degrees, expelled the monks; the cloisters became the camps of their retainers, the stables of their coursers, the kennels of their hounds, the meutes of their hawks. In Germany we have seen the extensive appropriation of the wealthiest monasteries by the lordly prelates. But

even now one of those periodical revolutions had begun, through which monasticism for many ages renewed its youth, either by restoring the discipline and austere devotion within the old convents, or by the institution of new orders, whose emulation always created a strong reaction throughout the world of Monachism. In France, William of Aquitaine, and Bruno of the royal house of Burgundy, began the reform. It had spread from Clugny under Odo and his successors; in Italy from Damiani, and from S. Gualberto in Vallombrosa; Herlembald was still upholding the banner of monkhood in Milan; in England the strong impulse given by Dunstan had not expired. Edward the Confessor, a monk upon the throne, had been not merely the second founder of the great Abbey of Westminster, but had edified and encouraged the monks by his example. Even in Germany a strong monastic party had begun to form: the tyranny and usurpation of the crown and of the great prelates could not but cause a deep, if silent revulsion.

Almost the first public act of Gregory VII. was a declaration of implacable war against these his two mortal enemies, simony and the marriage of the clergy. He was no infant Hercules; but the mature ecclesiastical Hercules would begin his career by strangling these two serpents; the brood, as he esteemed them, and parents of all evil. The decree of the synod held in Rome in the eleventh month of his pontificate is not extant, but in its inexorable provisions it went beyond the sternest of his predecessors. It absolutely invalidated all sacraments performed by simoniacal or married priests: ¹ baptism was

Gregory's
synod at
Rome.

March 9, 10,
1074.

¹ Gregorius Papa celebratâ synodo simoniacos anathematizavit, uxoratos

no regenerating rite ; it might almost seem that the Eucharistic bread and wine in their unhallowed hands refused to be transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ. The communicants guilty of perseverance at least in the sin, shared in the sacerdotal guilt. Even the priesthood were startled at this new and awful doctrine, that the efficacy of the sacraments depended on their own sinlessness. Gregory, in his headstrong zeal, was promulgating a doctrine used afterwards by Wycliffe and his followers with such tremendous energy. And this was a fearless, democratical provocation to the people ; for it left to notoriety, to public fame, to fix on any one the brand of the hidden sin of simony, or (it might be the calumnious) charge of concubinage ; and so abandoned the holy priesthood to the judgment of the multitude.¹

sacerdotes a divinio officio removit, et laicis missam eorum audire interdixit *novo exemplo* et (ut multis visum est) inconsiderato præjudicio contra sanctorum patrum sententiam qui scripserunt, quod sacramenta quæ in ecclesiâ fiunt, baptismus videlicet, chrisma, corpus et sanguis Christi, Spiritu sancto latenter operante eorumdem sacramentorum effectum seu per bonos, seu per malos intra Dei ecclesiam dispensentur. Tamen quia Spiritus Sanctus mystice illa vivificat, nec meritis bonorum dispensatorum amplificantur, nec peccatis malorum extenuantur. — Sig. Gemblac. ad a. 1074. Matth. Paris sub eod. ann. West. Flor. Hist. ibid.

¹ Floto (ii. pp. 45 et seqq.) has well shown the terrible workings of this appeal to the populace. The peasants held that an *accusation* of simony or marriage exempted them from the payment of tithe. Read the letter of Theodorice of Verdun, Martene, Thes. 1. Compare too the “de Schismate Ildebrandi” (see on this book note farther on), in which are some frightful accounts of the ill-usage of the clergy by the rabble. One disgraceful proceeding, not undeserved, had been witnessed at Cremona by the interlocutor. Gregory’s advocate insists that the pope’s churchmanship was grieved and offended at this desecration of the sacerdotal character. Sicut a viris fidelibus didici, qui multa cum illo de talibus contulerunt, referre solitus erat, quod tam crudelia et gravia nunquam in presbyteros fieri mandavisset ; plurimum etiam se dolere solitum, quotiens imperitum vulgus hujusmodi novis injuriis moveretur displicuisse semper verbera sacerdotum, cades et vincula, cippos et carceres, si forte talia a laicis paterentur. pp. 161, 162.

But the extirpation of these two internal enemies Gregory VII. to the dignity and the power of the sacerdotal and the King of France. order was far below the holy ambition of Gregory; this was but clearing the ground for the stately fabric of his Theocracy. If, for his own purposes, he had at first assumed some moderation in his intercourse with the empire, over the rest of Latin Christendom he took at once the tone and language of a sovereign. We must rapidly survey, before we follow him into his great war with the empire, Gregory VII. asserting his autocracy over the rest of Latin Christendom. In the monastery of Clugny, accompanying, or vigilantly watching the German pontiffs in their Transalpine spiritual campaigns, Gregory had taken the measure of the weakness which had fallen on the monarchy of France. The first kings of the house of Capet were rather the heads of a coequal feudal federalty than kings; their personal character had not raised them above their unroyal position. King Robert, the son of Hugh Capet, had abandoned his wife Bertha, to whom he was deeply attached, because the imperious Church had discovered some remote impediment, both of consanguinity and spiritual affinity.¹ He had undergone seven years' penance; the Archbishop of Tours, who had sanctioned the incestuous wedlock, must submit to deposition. But Robert aspired to be, and was, a saint. Leo. IX. had held his council at Rheims in despite of Robert's successor (Henry I.), and compelled the prelates to desert the feudal banner of their king for that of their spiritual liege lord.² Hildebrand's

¹ She was his cousin in the fourth degree; he had been godfather to one of Bertha's children by her former marriage.

² Concil. Rem., A.D. 998.

letters to Philip I., King of France, are in the haughtiest, most criminatory terms. "No king has reached such a height of detestable guilt in oppressing the churches of his kingdom as Philip of France." He puts the King to the test; his immediate admission of a Bishop of Macon, elected by the clergy and people, without payment to the crown. Either let the King repudiate this base traffic of simony, and allow fit persons to be promoted to bishoprics, or the Franks, unless apostates from Christianity, will be struck with the sword of excommunication, and refuse any longer to obey him.¹ In a later epistle to the Bishops of France, describing the enormous wickedness of the land, among other crimes the plunder and imprisonment of pilgrims on their way to Rome, he charges the King, or rather the tyrant of France, as the head and cause of all this guilt. Instead of suppressing, he is the example of all wickedness.² The plunder of all merchants, especially Italians, who visit France, takes place by royal authority. He exhorts the bishops to admonish him, rebukes their cowardly fears and want of dignity; if the King is disobedient, the Pope commands them to excommunicate him, and to suspend all religious services throughout France.³ At one time, in the affair of the Archbishop Manasseh of Rheims, all the Archbishops of France were under excommunication.

Whether as part of the new Roman policy, which looked to the Italian Normans as its body-guard in the approaching contest with the Transalpine

¹ Ad Roderic. Cabillon, i. 35, Dec. 4, 1079.

² Ad Episcop. Franc. ii. 5, Sept. 10, 1074, still stronger, ii. 32, Dec. 8, 1074. Compare Letter to Philip, i. 75, to the Count of Ponthieu, ii. 18, Nov. 13, 1074.

³ Regest., v. 17.

powers, and therefore would propitiate that brave and rising race throughout the world, Hildebrand's predecessor (and Alexander II. did no momentous act without the counsel of Hildebrand) had given a direct sanction to the Norman Conquest of England.¹ The banner of St. Peter floated in the van of the Bastard at Hastings. The reliques, over which Harold had been betrayed into the oath of abandoning his claims on the throne to William, were ostentatiously displayed. It was with the full papal approbation, or rather with the actual authority of the Pope, that Stigand, the Anglo-Saxon primate was deposed, and the Anglo-Saxon hierarchy ejected from all the higher dignities, the bishoprics and abbacies. A papal bull declared it illegal to elect a Saxon to a high benefice. The holiness of the sainted Confessor was forgotten. The Norman abbey of Bec must furnish primates, the Norman hierarchy prelates, not all of the same high ecclesiastical character as Lanfranc and Anselm, for conquered England.

Hildebrand may have felt some admiration, even awe of the congenial mind of the Conqueror. Yet with England the first intercourse of Gregory was an imperious letter to Archbishop Lanfranc concerning the Abbey of St. Edmondsbury, over which he claimed papal jurisdiction.² To the King his language is courteous. He advances the claim to Peter's pence over the kingdom. William admits this claim : it was among the stipulations, it was the price which the Pope had imposed for his assent to the Conquest. But to the demand of fealty, the Conqueror returns an answer of haughty brevity : " I have not, nor will I swear fealty,

¹ Compare Letter to Lanfranc, Regest. v., also on England, viii. 1, ix. 5.

² Alexandri Epist. apud Lanfranc, iv.

which was never sworn by any of my predecessors to yours.”¹ And William maintained his teutonic independence — created bishops and abbots at his will — was absolute lord over his ecclesiastical as over his feudal liegemen.²

To the kings of Spain, in one of his earliest letters, Pope Gregory boldly asserts that the whole ^{Gregory and} realm of Spain is not only within the spiritual ^{Spain.} jurisdiction of the Holy See, but her property; whatever part may be conquered from the usurping infidels may be granted by the Pope, or held by the conquerors as his vassals. He reminds the kings of Spain, Alphonso of Castile, and Sancho of Arragon, of the ancient obedience of Spain to the Apostolic See, and exhorts them not to receive the services of Toledo, but that of Rome.³

No part of Latin Christendom was so remote or so barbarous as to escape his vigilant determination to bring it under his vast ecclesiastical unity.⁴ While yet a deacon he had corresponded with Sweyn, king of Denmark; on him he bestows much grave and excellent advice. In a letter to Olaf, king of Norway, he dissuades him solemnly from assisting the rebellious brothers of the Danish king.⁵

¹ Fidelitatem facere nolui nec volo, quia nec ego promisi, nec antecessores meos antecessoribus tuis id fecisse comperio. — Lanfranc. Oper. Epist. x.

² William's temper in such matters was known. An abbot of Evreux went to complain at Rome. William said, “I have a great respect for the Pope's Legate in things which concern religion. Mais, ajouta-t-il, si un moine de mes terres osait porter plainte contre moi, je le ferai pendre à l'arbre le plus élevé de la forêt.” — Depping, Hist. des Normands, p. 350.

³ Regest., i. 7, April 30, 1073, regnum Hispaniæ ab antiquo proprii juris S. Petri fuisse. He appeals to a legend of St. Paul having sent seven bishops from Rome to convert Spain, i. 64, March 19, 1074. Compare iv. 28.

⁴ Regest., ii. 51.

⁵ vi. 13.

Between the Duke of Poland and the King of the Russians he interposes his mediation. The son of the Russian had come to Rome to receive his kingdom from the hands of St. Peter.¹

The kingdom of Hungary, as that of Spain, he treats Oct. 28, 1074. as a fief of the papacy; he rebukes the King Solomon for daring to hold it as a benefice of the king of the Germans.²

He watches over Bohemia; his legates take under Jan. 31, 1074. their care the estates of the Church; he summons the Archbishop of Prague to Rome.³

Even Africa is not beyond the care of Hildebrand.⁴ The clergy and people of Carthage are urged to adhere to their archbishop — not to dread the arms of the Saracens, though that once flourishing Christian province, the land of Cyprian and Augustine, is so utterly reduced, that three bishops cannot be found to proceed to a legitimate consecration.⁵

¹ Regest., ii. 73, 74, April 20, 1075.

² *Regnum Hungariæ sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ proprium est*, ii. 13; compare ii. 63 (March 23, 1075), *Geusæ. R. H., consanguineus tuus* (Solomon) *a rege Teutonico non a Romano pontifice, usurpative obtinuit dominium ejus, ut credimus, divinum judicium impedivit.*

³ i. 45.

⁴ i. 23.

⁵ Regest., iii. 19, June, 1076. Compare a remarkable letter to Ahazir, King of Mauritania, iii. 21.

CHAPTER II.

KING HENRY IV. CANOSA.

BUT the Empire was the one worthy, one formidable antagonist to Hildebrand's universal theoracy, ^{Gregory and} whose prostration would lay the world be- ^{the Empire.} neath his feet. The Empire must acknowledge itself as a grant from the papacy, as a grant revocable for certain offences against the ecclesiastical rights and immunities ; it must humbly acquiesce in the uncontrolled prerogative of the Cardinals to elect the Pope ; abandon all the imperial claims on the investiture of the prelates and other clergy with their benefices ; release the whole mass of Church property from all feudal demands, whether of service or of fealty ; submit patiently to rebuke ; admit the Pope to dictate on questions of war and peace, and all internal government where he might detect, or suppose that he detected, oppression. This was the condition to which the words and acts of Gregory aspired to reduce the heirs of Charlemagne, the successors of the Western Cæsars.

These two powers, the Empire and the Papacy, had grown up with indefinite and necessarily con- ^{The Papacy} flicting relations ; each at once above and be- ^{and the} neath the other ; each sovereign and subject, with no distinct limits of sovereignty or subjection ; each acknowledging the supremacy of the other, but each re-

ducing that supremacy to a name, or less than a name. As a Christian, as a member of the Church, the Emperor was confessedly subordinate to the Pope, the acknowledged head and ruler of the Church.¹ As a subject of the Empire, the Pope owed temporal allegiance to the Emperor. The authority of each depended on loose and flexible tradition, on variable and contradictory precedents, on titles of uncertain signification, Head of the Church, Vicar of Christ ; Patrician, King of Italy, Emperor ; each could ascend to a time when they were separate and not dependent upon each other. The Emperor boasted himself the successor to the whole autocracy of the Cæsars, to Augustus, Constantine, Charlemagne : the Pope to that of St. Peter, or of Christ himself. On the other hand, when the Emperor claimed the right of nominating and electing the Pope, he could advance long, recent, almost unbroken precedent. The Pope, nevertheless, could throw himself still further back on his original independent authority, to the early times of the Church before the conversion of Constantine, and to the subsequent period before the election of the Pope had become of so much importance as to demand the constant supervision of the civil power ; above all, to the nature of that power, of divine not of human institution. Besides, on their part, Charlemagne no doubt, and his Transalpine successors, had received both the Patriciate and the Imperial crown, if not as a gift, yet from the hands of the Popes, and had been consecrated by them ; and so, if the imperial authority was not conferred, it was hal-

¹ Even Henry IV., perhaps in his despair, admitted that he might justly be deposed if he had abandoned the faith. — Henric. Epist. ad Pap. This was after the Council of Worms.

lowed and endowed with a stronger title to Christian obedience by that almost indispensable ceremony. Yet the power of the Cæsars mounted far higher, to the times when they were the sole autocratic representatives of all-ruling Rome; Cæsars to whom the Apostles themselves had paid loyal, conscientious obedience. Nero had been the higher power to whom Paul had enjoined subjection; and the temporal power itself, so said the Scripture in words of emphatic distinctness, was likewise of divine appointment. The agency of either being requisite to complete and ratify the power of the other, the popular conception would construe that consent, concurrence, or approval, into an act of free will, therefore of superiority. The perplexity would be without end; perplexity from which men would escape only by closing their eyes, and choosing their course in the blindness of desperate partisanship. The loftiest minds might espouse either side on a great immutable principle; each cause became a religion. Nor would either Pope or Emperor be without precedent or groundwork in the theory of his power, if he claimed, as each did, the right of acting towards his adversary as a rebel, and of deposing that rebel; the Emperor the right of appointing an Anti-pope, the Pope of setting up a rival Emperor.¹

The strife, therefore, might seem at once internecine and interminable; and in this mortal warfare the powers, which each commanded, were strangely coun-

¹ *Dixerat enim ille Sarabaita* (this was an opprobrious term for Pope Gregory) *quod in suâ esset potestate, quem vellet ad imperium promoveré, et quem vellet removere. Sed arguitur fœditatis testimonio libri pontificalis. Ibi enim legitur, quod ordinatio papæ atque episcoporum sit, et esse debet, per manus regum et imperatorum.* This declaration of Henry's panegyrist, Benzo (p. 1060), is fully confirmed by Gregory's acts and words.

terbalanced ; though in this age the advantage was on the side of the Pope. The Emperor might seem to wield the whole force of the Empire, to command an irresistible army ; the German soldiers were a terror to the Italians ; often had they marched, without encountering a foe, upon Rome itself. The Pope, on the other hand, was a defenceless prelate, by his character prohibited from bearing arms, without military force, without a defensible territory, with no allies on whom he could depend. Yet the Pope had no scruple in waging war by secular arms. War for the aggrandizement of the Church had no horrors for the vicegerent of Christ. Neither Gregory nor his successors, nor did the powerful Churchmen in other parts of the world, hesitate to employ, even to wield, the iron arms of knights and soldiery for spiritual purposes, as they did not to use spiritual arms for ends strictly secular. They put down ecclesiastical delinquents by force of arms ; they anathematized their political enemies. The sword of St. Peter was called in to aid the keys of St. Peter. Leo IX. had set the example of a military campaign against the Normans ; but these were thought at that time scarcely better than infidels. Neither the present nor the succeeding age would have been greatly shocked at the sight of a Pope, in complete armor, at the head of a crusade.¹ Nor were allies wanting to counterbalance the armies of the Empire. The policy of Pope Nicolas had attached the Normans to the Roman cause ; Gregory at one time had rashly cast off the Norman alliance ;

¹ Gregory decides the cases in which a priest may bear arms. He is condemned (si) arma militaria portaverit, excepto si pro tuendâ justitiâ suâ vel domini, vel amici, seu etiam pauperum, nec non pro defendendis ecclesiis. — Ad Britann., vii. 10.

but he was strong in that of the house of Tuscany. The Countess Beatrice, and her daughter Matilda, were his unshaken adherents. But the great power of each lay in the heart of his adversary's territory. In Rome the Counts of Tusculum and the neighboring barons were dangerous partisans of the Empire, because enemies of the Pope. At scarcely any period was the Emperor undisputed Lord of Germany. Unwilling, if not rebellious subjects, princes, often as powerful as himself, were either in arms, or watching a favorable opportunity for revolt. Usually there was some ambitious house waiting its time to raise itself upon the ruins of the ruling dynasty. Nor was the Church more united than the Empire. If many of the great ecclesiastics of the Empire, from Churchmanship, from religious fear, or jealousy of the temporal power, maintained the Papal cause beyond the Alps, the Emperor was rarely without powerful prelates on his side, even in Italy. But though thus in some degree thwarted and opposed, even by his natural subjects, the spiritual power of the Pope was of tremendous efficacy. The anathema, which in its theory at least, and in its unmitigated language, devoted its victim to eternal death, had hardly lost any of its terrors. In the popular belief, and that popular belief included the highest as well as the lowest, the actual doom of each man depended on the award of the clergy, that of nations on the supreme fiat of the Pope. The necessities of religious guidance and direction were far more deeply felt than those of temporal government. The world could do better without a Cæsar than without a Pope — at least without a priesthood, who at once, at the word of the Pope, suspended all their blessed offices. Without the Sacra-

ments salvation was impossible ; and these Sacraments ceased at once. If baptism was granted to infants, if to the dying the Eucharist was not absolutely denied ; yet even these were conceded only as acts of mercy, and on ample submission : to the excommunicated they were utterly, absolutely refused.

Anathema became, without shaking the common dread of its effects, the ordinary weapon employed by the Pope in his quarrels ; by Hildebrand it was fulminated with all the energy of his character. The more religious, indeed, had been for some time shocked at the lavish frequency with which this last extremity of punishment was inflicted, even on refractory bishops, and for ecclesiastical offences.¹ There might be some prudent apprehension lest it should lose its force by familiarity. But Damiani argues against it on the high religious ground of the utter disproportion of the punishment in many cases to the offence of the criminal. But it had long ceased to be confined to delinquencies against the faith or the practice of the Gospel.² A new class of crimes was gradually formed — disobedience to the clergy or the See of Rome in matters purely secu-

¹ Damiani remonstrates against the perpetual affixture of the anathema to all Papal, almost to all ecclesiastical decrees. He is afraid of impairing its solemnity: he would reserve it for more awful crimes, such as heresy. A man may almost inadvertently rush “in æternæ mortis barathrum,” find himself, for some trivial offence, the consort of heretics — continuo velut hæreticus et tanquam cunctis criminibus teneatur obnoxius, anathematis sententiâ condemnatur. — Epist. 1, xii., ad Alexas. Pap. Damiani has no doubt that the anathema eternally damns its victims! — Epist. 1, vii. and xiv.

² Anathema even aspired to temporal effects. Festinabimus a communione Christianæ societatis abscindere, ita ut nullam deinceps victoriam in bello, nullam prosperitatem habere possit in sæculo. — Ad Berengar, vi. 16. How, in a warlike and superstitious age, must this terrible omen have worked its own fulfilment!

lar ; encroachment, real or supposed, upon the property of the Church ; the assertion of rights questioned by the Church ; the withholding immunities claimed by the Church. It was not as infringing the doctrines of Christ as an infidel, or as a heretic ; it was not as violating the great moral law of Christ, not as a murderer or an adulterer, that the baron, the King, or the Emperor in general incurred the Papal ban and was thereby excluded from the communion of the faithful and from everlasting salvation ; it was as a contumacious subject of the worldly kingdom of the Supreme Pontiff.¹ Even where moral or spiritual offences were mingled up with the general charge, that of contumacy to the ecclesiastical superior was placed in the same rank, and to the common feelings of mankind was the real, if not avowed, ground of the censure.

But not only was the excommunicated himself under this awful condemnation, the ban comprehended all who communicated with excommunicated persons. Every one in the councils, every one in the army, every one who obeyed, almost every subject who rendered allegiance to an excommunicated prince, was virtually under excommunication ; and under the weight of this censure, with this aggravation of death before their eyes, men were to go forth to battle against those who proclaimed themselves the champions of the Church, the armies of the faith. To these, if immediate transition from the battle-field to paradise was not explicitly

¹ The Norman princes, to whom the Pope had granted their great possessions and privileges, and on whom the Papacy had for some time relied for its defence against the barons of the Campagna, having given offence, and Hildebrand being secure in the more powerful protection of Beatrice of Tuscany and her daughter, were excommunicated by the dauntless Pope.

promised, as afterwards to the crusaders in the Holy Land (Mohammedan rewards calculated to animate them against Mohammedan foes), yet they fought under consecrated banners; their heroes were compared with those of the Old Testament; the grateful Church, the dispenser of everlasting life and death, would not forget their services; St. Peter would recognize the faithful servants of his successor; their religious courage could not but rise to fanaticism; they were warring for the saints of God — for God himself.¹

But if on this broad and general view the Pope stood thus on the vantage ground in his contest with the Emperor, never was a time in which the adversaries met on more unequal terms; the Papacy in the fulness of its strength, the Empire at the lowest state of weakness. The Pope, Hildebrand, mature in age, of undisputed title, with a name which imposed awe throughout Latin Christendom, and with the unswerving conviction that, in raising the Papal power to the utmost, he was advancing the glory of God; perhaps, if he stooped to think

¹ Compare the elaborate argument of Bonizo, Bishop of Sutri, in favor of waging war against the adherents of Guibert the Antipope. After reciting all the soldiers named with honor in the New Testament, he goes on to infer that if it is lawful ever to wage war, it is against heretics. Did not S. Hilary arm King Clovis against the Arians? Did not S. Augustine urge Count Boniface to hang and every way to persecute the Donatists and Circumcellions? Did not Augustine, in his Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount on the text, "Blessed are ye who suffer persecution for righteousness sake," say that those are equally blessed who *inflict persecution* for the sake of righteousness! He quotes Jerome as saying, *non est impietas pro Deo crudelitas* (ad Rustic. Narbon). "Hear the teaching of the Fathers, look to the example of those who have fought for the truth!" He then triumphantly appeals to the burning of Hermogenes, the Prefect, at Constantinople, by the orthodox, the battles waged by the Alexandrians against the Arians, which are "praised throughout the world." He concludes with Cyril's sanctification of the monk Ammonius, who had attempted the life of the Prefect Orestes, as a martyr: he ends with the example of Pope Leo and of Herlembald of Milan.

on such subjects, the welfare of mankind. The Emperor, a youth, with all the disadvantages of youth, the passions and weaknesses of a boy ^{Character of Henry IV.} born to Empire, but with none of that adventitious and romantic interest which might attach the generous to his cause. He had been educated, if education it might be called, by a gentle and tender mother, by imperious Churchmen who had galled him with all that was humiliating with none of the beneficial effects of severe control.¹ They had only been indulgent to his amusements; they had not trained him to the duties of his station, or the knowledge of affairs and of man. In his earliest youth, thus altogether undisciplined, he had been compelled to contract a marriage for which he felt profound aversion; and the stern Churchmen, who had bound this burden upon him, refused to release him.² He tried to bribe Siegfried of Mentz to sanction the divorce, by promising his aid in despoiling the abbots of Fulda and Herzfeld of the tithes of Thuringia,³ but the Pope sent the stern Peter Damiani to forbid the evil example. "Well then," said Henry, "I will ^{1069.} bear the burden which I cannot throw off." And when, no doubt in consequence, he plunged with reckless impetuosity into the licentiousness which his station could command, this, unexcused, unpalliated, was turned to

¹ Stenzel, i. p. 249, has justly described the character of Henry and the evil influences of the domination of this ambitious, rapacious, and unprincipled hierarchy. The great German ecclesiastics abandoned him to himself where they should have controlled, controlled where they should have left him free. It might almost seem that they had studied to shear him of all his strength before he should be committed in his strife with Hildebrand.

² *Quam suasionibus principum invitus duxerat.* Bruno de Bello Saxónico, p. 176. He was but ten years old when he was forced to marry her: had never known her, as he declared.

³ Compare Stenzel, 254.

his shame and discredit by his inexorable adversaries. At length, indeed, his generous nature revolted at his ill-treatment of a gentle and patient wife. She bore A.D. 1071. him a son. From that time he was deeply attached to her. She was his faithful companion in all his trials and sorrows; she gave him four children. Thus with all the lofty titles, the pomp without the power, the burden with nothing but the enervating luxuries, none of the lofty self-confidence of one born and fitly trained to Empire, the character of Henry was still further debased by the shame of perpetual defeat and humiliation. His greater qualities, till they were forced out by adversity, his high abilities, till gradually ripened by use and experience, were equally unsuspected by his partisans and by his enemies.

The great contest of Henry's reign found the Emperor with no part of his subjects attached to his person, with but few regarding the dignity of the Empire irrespective of their own private interests, and with the most powerful and warlike in actual rebellion. The day after the inauguration of Pope Gregory the Saxon princes met, and determined on their revolt. Nothing can show more clearly the strange confusion of civil and religious matters than the course of proceedings during this conflict. The Saxon insurrection takes the character of a religious war. The confederates first named by the historian are Wenzel Archbishop of Magdeburg, Burchard Bishop of Halberstadt, the Bishops of Hildesheim, Merseburg, Minden, Paderborn, and Meissen. The three ecclesiastics favorable to the cause of Henry, Licmar Archbishop of Bremen, the Bishops of Zeitz and Osnaburg, are obliged to fly the country. To the first

Saxon revolt
against
Henry.

June 29, 30,
1073.

imperative demand, the demolition of the castles which Henry had built on many of the hills and mountain fastnesses, to control these turbulent Saxon chieftains, they added these terms ; — that he should dismiss his favorites, and commit the administration of affairs to his legitimate counsellors, the princes of the Empire ; that he should disperse the bevy of concubines which he maintained, contrary to decency and to the canons of the Church, and reinstate his lawful wife in his bed and in his affections ; and so altogether abandon the follies of his youth. “ If he refused their just demands, they were Christians, and would not be defiled by communion with a man who insulted the Christian faith through such wickedness. They were bound by an oath of allegiance ; and if he would rule for the edification, not the destruction of the Church, justly and according to ancient usage, maintain inviolate the law, rights, and liberties of all, their oath was valid ; but if he first broke his oath they were absolved from theirs ; they would wage war upon him, even to death, as a Barbarian, and as an enemy of the Christian name, for the Church of God, the faith of Christ, and their own liberties.” It was well for Henry that this first Saxon revolt was quelled before the breaking out of direct hostilities with Gregory ; for if his insurgent subjects could issue a manifesto so bold, and in some respects so noble, what had been the consequence if the Pope had supported their demands ? Thuringia,¹ as well as Saxony, was in arms, and Henry received his first bitter if instructive lesson of humiliation. His revolted subjects had openly avowed the right of deposing him. “ So

¹ A dispute concerning the tithes of that whole region, claimed and levied by the Archbishop of Mentz, was involved in the rebellion of Thuringia.

great was his wickedness, that he ought not only to abdicate his throne, but be stripped of his military belt, and for his sins forswear the world.”¹ He had been publicly accused by Reginer, a noble of high character, of conspiring basely to massacre the princes of the Empire; and the challenge of Reginer to make good his charge in single combat had been eluded rather than cheerfully accepted in bold defiance of its injustice. Henry, unequal to these adversaries, had been reduced to the utmost poverty, to abject flight and concealment. One city alone, Worms, adhered to the Emperor’s waning fortune, and gave time for the formidable league to fall asunder. Henry found that there was still power in the name of the King and Emperor; many of the princes on the Rhine, with the great prelates, rallied around the sovereign; the battle of Hohenburg broke the Saxon power; the principal insurgents had been betrayed into his hands, for Henry scrupled not at perfidy to regain his authority.

Till the close of this Saxon war the Pope had maintained a stately neutrality; events had followed so rapidly, that even had he been disposed, he could scarcely have found time for authoritative interposition. The first overt act of Hildebrand relating to the Emperor,² had been a general admonition

Neutrality of
the Pope.

¹ *Militare cingulum et omnem prorsus sæculi usum quanto magis regnum abdicare.* The Saxons fought *pro ecclesiâ Dei, pro fide Christianorum, pro libertate suâ*, p. 197. — Lambert of Herzfeld. See on Lambert of Herzfeld, improperly called of Aschaffenburg, the Preface of Pertz. It is fortunate that, for these critical times, we have perhaps the best of the monastic historians — he is our chief authority — with the “*De Bello Saxonico*” of Bruno, and Berthold. Floto’s *Heinrich IV. und seine Zeit*, is a constant, to me mostly unsuccessful, attempt to depreciate Lambert. — Note 1856.

² Yet he meditated the coming strife. To Duke Godfrey he writes that

to the King to return into the bosom of his mother, the holy Roman Church, and to rule the Empire in a more worthy manner; to abstain from simoniacal presentations to benefices; to render due allegiance to his spiritual superior. But when he spoke of Henry to his more confidential friends, it was in another tone. If his admonitions are treated with contempt it will not move him. "It is safer for us to resist him for his salvation to the shedding of our blood, than by yielding to his will, to consent to his ruin."¹ The admonition probably reached Henry in the most perilous time of his war with the Saxons; he had hardly escaped from their hands, had either fled, or was meditating his ignominious flight from the castle in the Hartzberg. His reply, as suited his fortunes, was in the most submissive tone. He acknowledged his sins against Heaven and the Pope; he attributed them to his youth, to the intoxication of imperial power, to the seductions of evil counsellors. He had invaded the property of the Church; he had made simoniacal promotions of unworthy persons. He entreated the clemency of the Pope; he trusted that from henceforth the kingdom and the priesthood, bound together by the necessity of mutual assistance, might adhere to each other in indissoluble union.² Hilde-

The Pope's
admonition
to King
Henry.

Aug. 8, 1073.

About Aug.
18.

he would send envoys to Henry — quod si nos audierit non aliter de ejus quam nostra salute gaudemus: sin vero nobis odium pro dilectione reddiderit, interminatio qua dicitur, maledictus homo qui prohibet gladium suum a sanguine, super nos, *Deo providente*, non veniet. — May, 1073, Regest. i. 9. Compare letter to Rudolph of Suabia, i. 19.

¹ Gregor. Epist. ad Beatricem et Mathildam, 1, xi.

² Epistola Henric. Regis. Mansi, date about Aug. 18, 1073. I refer to this letter Gregory's remarkable words: — "Henricum regem præterea scias dulcedinis et obedientiæ plena nobis verba misisse, et talia, qualia neque

brand was delighted with language more gentle and lowly than had ever been used by the predecessors of Henry to the pontiffs of Rome. Hildebrand even then had not confined himself to his admonition to Henry; he had already erected himself into supreme arbiter of the affairs of Germany. A letter to the insurgent prelates, the Archbishop of Magdeburg, the Bishop of Halberstadt, and the Saxon princes, commanded them to suspend their arms until he should have inquired into the justice of their quarrel with the King their Lord.¹ This was more than a solemn persuasive to peace, and a religious remonstrance on the homicides, conflagrations, the plunder of the churches and of the poor, and the desolation of the country (such language had been becoming in the vicar of Christ); he took the tone of a supreme judge. An act of sacrilege on the part of the Saxons gave Henry, as he supposed, a favorable opportunity for placing the spiritual power on his own side. While negotiations were proceeding, a rising of the Saxon people took place in the neighborhood of Hartzburg. This was the strong fortress which commanded the whole country; from which Henry had made incursions to waste the district around, in which he had found secure refuge from the popular indignation, and from which he had but now been forced to fly. But so long as the Hartzburg remained impregnable, the Saxon liberties were insecure; with but a garrison there the Emperor might at any time renew hostilities. The insurgents surprised this stronghold, but were not con-

ipsum neque antecessores suos recordamur Romanis Pontificibus misisse." — Herlembaldo. Regest. i. 25, Sept. 27, 1073. On Henry's conduct in this affair Gregory lays great weight.

¹ Regest. i. 39, Dec. 20, 1073.

tent with levelling the military works to the ground. Henry had built a temporary church of timber, furnished with great elegance. The insurgents scrupled not to destroy this sacred edifice, to plunder the treasures, to break the altar to pieces. In wanton insult, or with a fixed design to break the bonds of Henry's attachment to the place, they dug up the bodies of a brother and a son whom he had buried there. The reliques of the Saints were saved with diffi- Feb. 24, 1174. culty, and carried by the trembling clergy to a neighboring sanctuary. The Saxon chieftains shuddered at the consequences of this rash act; Henry's indignation knew no bounds. To that power which was to be used with such commanding energy against himself, he did not hesitate to appeal. He sent messages to Rome to demand the censures of the Pope against the Saxons, all of whom he involved in the odious charge of burning churches, breaking down altars, violating Christian graves, and barbarously insulting the remains of the dead.

But the vengeance of Henry was fulfilled; the Saxon insurrection had been put down at Hohenburg (1075) without the interposition of the Pope, before indeed he could come to any decided resolution.

An embassy in the mean time had arrived in Germany from Rome — an embassy, it might seem, intended to work on the pious feelings Embassy from Rome. as well as on the fears of the king. The mother of Henry had left her peaceful convent sanctuary, and accompanied the Papal legates, the Bishops of Præneste, Ostia, and Cunæ. Henry was accustomed from his youth to the overweening haughtiness — he had experienced the tyranny — of the prince prelates of Germany.

The Italian bishops bred in the school of Hildebrand held even a more high and dictatorial tone. Their first demands were abject, unquestioning submission. They refused to communicate with the King till he had done penance for all his simoniacal acts, and had been absolved from the ban of the Church, under which he lay, either actually or virtually, as employing excommunicated persons for his counsellors. They demanded the dismissal of those persons against whom Pope Alexander had issued his censures, the bishops of Ratisbon, Constance, and Lausanne, the Counts Eberhard and Ulric. They required him also to summon a council of the prelates of Germany and Gaul, in which they were to preside, as representing the Pope. The avowed object of this council was the degradation of all the prelates who owed their rise to simoniacal means. Henry at this time hardly looked beyond his immediate advantages, and the gratification of his passions. Partly yielding to the persuasions of his mother, partly out of revenge against some of the Saxon prelates, obnoxious to censure, especially from hatred of the Bishop of Worms, who alone opposed his unbounded popularity in that city, he was disposed to acquiesce in the convocation of the Council, and to allow full scope to its proceedings.

But most of the bishops dreaded this severe inquisition into their titles; others, of whom the chief was Licmar, the learned and sagacious Archbishop of Bremen, stood upon the privileges of the German Church. It was determined that, unless the Pope appeared in person, his representative, and the only lawful president of such a council, was the primate of Germany. Siegfried, Archbishop of Mentz, a man

German
prelates.

of timid and vacillating character, was as ill-qualified to be the representative of Hildebrand in Germany, as boldly to oppose his ambitious encroachments. He feared alike the Pope and the King. The fate of some of his brother prelates might well make him tremble, if the King, notwithstanding his seeming acquiescence, should enter into the contest, and the popular favor take the part of the King. The Bishop of Worms had been driven from his city with the utmost indignity; and it was doubtful whether it was not a faction, ^{Hanno of Cologne.} eager to avenge the royal cause, which had endangered the life of Hanno, the great Archbishop of Cologne, expelled him from the city, and maintained Cologne for some time in a state of defiant rebellion.¹ The origin of this tumult may show the haughty tyranny of these kingly prelates. The Archbishop was about to leave the city after the celebration of Easter. A vessel was wanted for his voyage. His people, after examining all that were in the port (this purveyance it must be presumed, was of ancient usage), chose that of a rich merchant, cast the valuable lading on the shore, and proceeded to seize the bark for the Archbishop's use. The merchant's men resisted, headed by his son: it ended in a furious fray. When the Archbishop heard of it, he threatened summary punishment against the seditious youths. "For," proceeds the historian, "he was a man endowed with every virtue, and renowned for his justice in civil, as well as in ecclesiastical causes." Lambert admits, indeed, "that he was liable to transports of ungovernable anger." The whole city rose in insurrection; the Archbishop was hurried, to save his

¹ Incertum levitate vulgi, an factione eorum qui vicem regis in archiepiscopum ulcisci cupiebant, etc., — Lambert, sub ann. 1074.

life, to the church of St. Peter. His palace, his cellars were plundered: his chapel, with the pontifical robes, and even the sacred vessels, destroyed; one of his attendants, mistaken for the Archbishop, was killed: the Archbishop hardly made his escape in disguise. But the country people were attached to Hanno, perhaps hated the citizens; a military force sprang up among his vassals; the city was forced to surrender. Six hundred of the wealthiest merchants withdrew to the court of King Henry to implore his intercession. The soldiers of the Archbishop, it was given out, without his sanction plundered and committed horrible cruelties. The Archbishop wreaked a terrible vengeance on the first movers in the tumult; the son of the merchant and many others were blinded, many scourged, and the city, the richest and most powerful north of the Alps, was a long time before it recovered its former prosperity.

Siegfried of Mentz might well quail before the difficulties of his position. Not merely was he called upon to summon this dreaded Council, but to carry at once into effect the stern and peremptory decrees of Hildebrand, and the councils which he had held at Rome for the suppression of the married clergy. Throughout Western Christendom these decrees had met with furious, or with sullen and obstinate opposition. In Lombardy not all the preaching of Ariald, nor his martyrdom; not all the eloquence of Damiani, not all the tyranny of Herlembald, nor even the fanaticism of the people, who were taught to abstain from the unholy ministrations of this defiled priesthood, had succeeded in extirpating the evil. Herlembald was now about to suffer the miserable or glorious destiny of Ariald.

Siegfried knew the state of the German clergy ; ^{March 18,} it was not till he was formally threatened with ^{1074.} the Papal censure that he consented to promulgate the decree of Gregory.¹ Even then he attempted to temporize. He did not summon the clergy at once to show their obedience ; he allowed them six months of delay for consideration — six months employed by the clergy only to organize a more obstinate opposition.

A synod met at Erfurt. The partisans of the marriage of the clergy assembled in prevailing ^{October,} numbers. Their language among themselves ^{1074.} had been unmeasured. “ The Pope,” they said, “ must be a heretic or a madman. Has he forgotten the saying of the Lord ? All cannot fulfil his word. The apostle says, ‘ Let him that cannot contain marry.’ He would compel all men to live like angels. Let him take care, while he would do violence to nature, he break not all the bonds which restrain from fornication and every uncleanness. They had rather abandon their priesthood than their wives, and then let the Pope, who thought men too grovelling for him, see if he can find angels to govern the Church.”² Siegfried could not but betray that he was acting a part in opposition to his own judgment ; his arguments, therefore, had little effect. The clergy withdrew to deliberate. Some proposed quietly to return to their own homes. Some of the more violent, with confused but intelligible menace, called for vengeance on him who dared to promulgate this execrable decree ; they threatened to depose the Archbishop, and even to put him to death, as a warning

¹ Siegfried had been already rebuked for other causes by the Pope. — Regest. i. 60.

² Lambert, sub ann.

to his successors not to publish such statutes, which they strangely affected to treat as calumnious to the priesthood. The affrighted primate expressed his readiness to appeal to Rome, and to endeavor to obtain some mitigation at least of the obnoxious law. Either to distract the assembly from the main subject in debate, or from mere folly or rapacity, he suddenly revived an old question of his claim on the tithes of Thuringia. These claims had been settled in the treaty at Gerstungen; and the enraged Thuringians, at first with sullen murmurs, at length with open violence, so terrified the Archbishop, that he was glad to make his way, environed by his own soldiers, out of the town. So closed the synod of Erfurt.

But the impatient zeal of Hildebrand would brook no delay. At the head of his Roman clergy, men vowed by conscience and religion, by interest and pride, to his cause (Guibert of Ravenna, the Emperor's representative, the representative of the German party in Italy, as yet ventured no opposition), he determined at all hazards, even that of changing the yet obsequious, or at least consenting, Emperor, from an ally in the subjugation of the simoniacal and married clergy into an implacable antagonist,¹ to strike at the root of all these abuses, comprehended under the opprobrious name of simony. He might justly apprehend that the total suppression of the evil was absolutely impossible, while the temporal sovereign possessed the power of conferring spiritual benefices. As long as the greater

¹ In a letter to King Henry (Dec. 7, 1074) he praises him for his amicable reception of his envoys, rejoices that he had determined to destroy simony and the fornication of the clergy. — ii. 30. Compare 31, where he proposes a crusade against the infidels.

dignities, the rich abbeys, or even stations of inferior rank and authority, coveted for their wealth, their dignity, or even their ease or quiet, were in any way at the disposal of the laity, so long would an impoverished sovereign traffic in these promotions, or an ambitious sovereign crowd them with his creatures — each regardless of the worthiness of those elevated to the sacred offices, either looking for remuneration out of the actual revenues of the see, or in servile adherence to his commands.¹ But the Church, as a great proprietor of lands, originally granted and mostly held on the common feudal tenure, was bound by the laws which regulated other benefices. It had been content to receive these estates with their secular advantages and their secular services. The temporal power throughout declared that it did not bestow, or if it sold for any stipulated gift or service the benefice attached to the see, the abbacy, or the prebend, it did not presume to sell the spiritual function, but only the property of the endowment. The sovereign was the liege lord, not of the bishop or the abbot in his hierarchical, solely in his feudal rank.

The form of investiture, indeed, was in favor of Gregory's views; the ring and the staff which the bishop received from the temporal sovereign. The ring, the symbol of his mystic marriage with his diocese; the staff, the sceptre of his spiritual sway, might seem to belong exclusively to his holy function. But this investiture conveyed the right to the temporal possessions

¹ But were the Popes guiltless? Herman of Bamberg had bought his bishopric; he was accused as a Simoniac, and summoned to Rome. By large gifts to Alexander II. he not only obtained pardon under a covenant not to sell any church preferments — he returned in honor with an archbishop's pall. — Lambert, sub ann. 1070.

or endowments of the benefice ; it assigned a local jurisdiction to the bishop ; it was in one form the ancient consent of the laity to the spiritual appointment ; it presumed not to consecrate, but permitted the consecrated person to execute his office in a certain defined sphere, and under the protection and guarantee of the civil power. This was only the outward mark of allegiance ; the acknowledgment of the secular supremacy as far as the estate or its feudal obligations.

In a council held at Rome at the beginning of the year 1075, Gregory abrogated by one decree the whole right of investiture by the temporal sovereign.¹

Synod of
Rome, Feb.
24-28 about
investitures.

The prohibition was couched in the most imperious and comprehensive terms. It absolutely deposed every bishop, abbot, or inferior ecclesiastic who should receive investiture from any lay person. It interdicted him, whosoever should be guilty of this act of ambition and rebellion (which was the sin of idolatry) until he should have abandoned the benefice so obtained, from all communion in the favor of St. Peter, and from admission into the Church. And if any Emperor, duke, marquis, count, or secular potentate or person should presume to grant such investiture of bishopric or inferior dignity, he was condemned to the same sentence. This statute

¹ Si quis deinceps episcopatum vel abbatiam de manu alicujus laicæ personæ susceperit, nullatenus inter episcopos vel abbates habeatur, nec ulla ei ut episcopo aut abbati audientia concedatur. Insuper ei gratiam beati Petri, et introitum ecclesiæ interdicimus, quoad usque locum, quem sub crimine tam ambitionis quam inobedientiæ, quod est scelus idololatriæ, deseruerit. Similiter etiam de inferioribus ecclesiasticis dignitatibus constituimus. Item, si quis Imperatorum, Ducum, Marchionum, Comitum, vel quilibet sæcularium potestatum, aut personarum, investituram episcopatus, vel alicujus ecclesiasticæ dignitatis dare præsumperit, ejusdem sententiæ vinculo se astrictum sciat. — Labbe. Concil., p. 342.

made a revolution in the whole feudal system throughout Europe as regarded the relation of the Church now dominant to the State. In the Empire it annulled the precarious power of the Sovereign over almost half his subjects. All the great prelates and abbots, who were at the same time the princes, the nobles, the counsellors, the leaders in the Diets and national assemblies, became to a great degree independent of the Crown: the Emperor had no concern, unless indirectly, in their promotion, no power over their degradation. Their lands and estates were as inviolable as their persons. Where there was no fealty there could be no treason. Every benefice, on the other hand, thus dissevered from the Crown was held, if not directly, yet at the pleasure of the Pope. For as with him was the sole judgment (the laity being excluded) as to the validity of the election, with him was the decision by what offences the dignity might be forfeited; and as the estates and endowments were now inalienable, and were withdrawn from the national property and became that of the Church and of God, the Pope might be in fact the liege lord, temporal and spiritual, of half the world.

From this time the sudden and total change takes place in the courteous and respectful, if still jealous and guarded, intercourse between Henry and the Pope. Till now Henry was content to sacrifice the simoniacal and the married clergy, and to be the submissive agent of the Pope in their degradation. They are now, with short intervals but of seeming peace, resolute, declared, unscrupulous, remorseless enemies. Each is determined to put forth his full powers, each to enlist in his party the subjects of the other. If Gregory had condescended, which he

Breach between the Pope and the Emperor.

did not, to dissemble his deliberate scheme, his avowed sacred duty to subject the temporal to the spiritual power, a man of Henry's experience, even if without natural sagacity, could not but perceive what was now at issue. This act despoiled the Emperor of one of his most valuable prerogatives ; a prerogative indispensable to his authority.

Nor was Henry now in a condition tamely to endure the aggression even of the Pope. The sudden revolution in the German mind in his favor, the victory of Hohenburg, the submission of the Saxons, the captivity of their chiefs (the fruits of that victory) might have intoxicated a mind less unused to success. Nor was he without powerful allies, pledged by their interests to his cause, and incensed by the bold and uncompromising manner in which the Pope asserted and seemed determined to enforce his supremacy.¹ The German Church as shown at Erfurt, had still a strong inclination to independence. Of the more powerful prelates, some indeed were old, some irresolute ; but some, sharing in his condemnation, were committed to his side. Hanno of Cologne died² during the early part of the contention. Siegfried of Mentz was timid, wavering, consciously oppressed by the fearful responsibility of his position. By the same Roman synod, Licmar, Archbishop of Bremen, Werner of Strasburg, Herman of Bamberg, Henry of Spire, William of Pavia, Cunibert of Turin, Dionysius of Piacenza, besides the three

¹ See the additions made to the Regesta of Gregory VII., in Mabillon Correspondence, ii. 143.

² Dec. 4, 1075. According to Lambert he went "ad angelos." Miracles were wrought at his tomb. See his high character, a sort of ideal of a prelate of those days. "If austere, magnificent; lavish to monasteries;" of his ambition and worldly pride not a word! Compare Berthold, sub ann.

Bishops of Constance, Zeitz, and Lausanne, the proscribed counsellors of Henry, were interdicted from the performance of their functions. The Saxon prelates were now conquered rebels; the Bishop of Worms an exile from his city. Few were disposed by denying the legality of lay investiture to imperil their own right to the estates of their churches. But the more determined and reckless resistance was among the partisans of the married clergy. Siegfried, yielding to the urgent commands, to the menaces of the Pope, called a second synod at Mentz.¹ The Papal Legate was present; he displayed the mandate of the Apostolic See, that the bishops in their several dioceses should compel the priests to renounce their wives or abstain altogether from their sacred ministry. The whole assembly rose; so resolute was their language, so fierce were their gestures, that the Archbishop again trembled for his life. He declared that from henceforth he would take no concern in such perilous matters, but leave the Pope to execute his own decrees.

At Passau the Bishop Altman had already not only published the papal prohibition against the marriage of the clergy; he interdicted the married clergy from the altar. He had met with stubborn, sullen resistance. On St. Stephen's Day he ascended the pulpit, A.D. 1074. and read the Pope's brief; he would have been torn in pieces but for the intervention of some of the powerful citizens. Bishop Henry of Coire hardly escaped with his life.²

No doubt it was this which raised a fixed and deter-

¹ Lambert.

² Lambert, sub ann. 1074. Compare Vit. Altmanni, apud Pertz, xiv. p. 232.

Effects of decree against married clergy.

mined opposition to Hildebrand in a large party of the clergy throughout Latin Christendom, more especially in Italy and in Germany.¹ The manner in which the Pope commanded the execution of the decree aggravated its harshness and cruelty. The Pope deliberately sacrificed the cherished sanctity, the inviolability of the priesthood; or rather he disowned as a priesthood, and cast forth to shame and ignominy those whom he branded as unworthy of its privileges. The personal exposure and degradation could not be more galling. By the judgment of the laity, by force employed against them by unhalloved hands, they were not merely to be prohibited from their sacred functions; they were expelled from the choir, and thrust down into the place of the penitents. Even bishops were to be summarily degraded, or rather not recognized as bishops.² Who may imagine the fierceness of the more rude and profligate, thus sternly and almost suddenly interrupted in their licentiousness; whose secret but ill-concealed voluptuousness was dragged to light and held up to shame and obloquy, perhaps to the now unawed vengeance of the injured husband or father. In proportion to their unprincipled looseness would be the passion of their resentment, the depth of their vindictiveness. But these, it may be charitably, and as far as the documents show, justly concluded, were the few. What must have been the bitterness of heart of those, the far larger part of the clergy, whose marriage, or at least an implied

¹ Berthold (sub ann. 1075) says of the edict against the marriage of the clergy, that it caused maximum odium in dominum apostolicum, et *perpau-*
cos eos qui consentirent ei. — Apud Pertz, p. 278. Yet Berthold was an Hildebrandist.

² Letter to Adela, Countess of Flanders, iv. 10, and to Robert, iv. 11.

and solemn engagement, almost as sacred as marriage, had been endeared by the sweet charities of life, by the habits of mutual affection, the common ties of parental love. Their wives were to be torn from them, and treated with the indignity of prostitutes; their children to be degraded as bastards. In some cases these wretched women were driven to suicide; they burned themselves, or were found dead in their beds from grief, or by their own hands; and this was proclaimed as the vengeance of God upon their sins.¹ With some of the married clergy there may have been a consciousness, a misgiving of wrong, at least of weakness inconsistent with the highest clerical function; but with others it was a deliberate conviction, founded on the authority of St. Paul; on the usage of the primitive Church, justified by the law of Eastern Christendom, and in Milan asserted to rest on the authority of St. Ambrose; as well as on a conscientious assurance of the evils, the manifest and flagrant evils, of enforced clerical celibacy. And these men, even when they acknowledged their weakness, and were content with the lower stations in religious estimation, were to be mingled up in one sweeping anathema with the worst profligates; to be condemned to poverty and shame, to be thrown loose to the popular judgment, the popular jealousy, the popular fury.

¹ Paul Bernried triumphs in the misery of these women, many of them the wives, as he acknowledges, of the clergy. *Interea super ipsas quoque uxores, seu concubinas Nicolaitarum sævit divina ultio. Nam quædam illarum in reprobum sensum traditæ, semetipsas incendio tradiderunt: aliquæ dum sanæ cubitum issent mortuæ repertæ sunt in matutino absque ullo præeunte infirmitatis indicio: aliquarum etiam corpora, post evulsas animas, maligni spiritus rapientes et in sua latibula reponentes, humanâ sepulturâ privaverunt.* In what shape did these malignant spirits appear? Vit. Gregory VII Murat. S. I. iii.

It was not indeed in Germany or Lombardy alone that the opposition to one or both the Hildebrandine decrees against lay investiture and the marriage of the clergy encountered fierce opposition. The latter, as of more immediate operation, excited the most furious passion. It was about this time that the Archbishop of Rouen, venturing to read the decree in his cathedral, was driven from the pulpit with a shower of stones. At the Council of Paris,¹ when the decree was read, there was a loud outcry of appeal to St. Paul's Epistle to Timothy. The Abbot of Pont-Isère² dared to say that the Pope's commands, just or unjust, must be obeyed. He was dragged out of the assembly, spat upon, struck in the face by the King's servants, hardly rescued alive.³ Everywhere, in Italy, in Rome itself, in France, throughout Germany, the decrees were received with the most vigorous or stubborn oppugnance; Gregory acknowledges the reluctance with which it was submitted to by the great mass of the clergy, the tardiness of the bishops to enforce its penalties.⁴ This, doubtless, more than the strife with the empire, and the collision between the Italian and German party, was the chief source of the deep and wide-spread rancor excited in

¹ Mansi, sub ann. Orderic. Vital.

² If the bishops of France, writes Gregory, are lukewarm in enforcing these decrees, we hereby interdict the people from attending the ministrations of such false priests. — iv. 20.

³ Epist. Theodor. Virdunens. ad Gregor. VII. Martene et Durand. i. 218. Epistola cujusdam, p. 231. The populace sometimes took the other side. The people of Cambray burned a man for venturing to say that the Simoniac or married clergy were not to be allowed to say mass. So writes Gregory. The clergy of Cambray were generally married. Gregory would make this man a martyr.

⁴ Ad hæc tamens inobedientes, *exceptis perpuacis*, tam execrandam consuetudinem (simony and marriage) nullâ studuerunt prohibitione decidere, nullâ distictione punire. — Ad Rodolph. ii. 45.

the hearts of men, rancor almost unprecedented, against Gregory VII. Later history shows Hildebrand, if not an object of admiration, of awe. ^{Hatred against Hildebrand.}

Those who most deprecate his audacious ambition, his assumption of something bordering on divinity, respect the force and dignity of his character. The man who by the mere power of mind, by spiritual censures, without an army, except that which he levied by his influence over others, with enemies in his own city, aspired to rule the world, to depose the mightiest sovereigns, to raise up a barrier against the dominion of mere brute force and feudal tyranny, is contemplated, if by some with enthusiastic veneration, by others if with aversion, as the Incarnation of anti-Christian spiritual pride, nevertheless not without the homage of their wonder, and wonder not unmingled with respect. But in his own day the hostility against his name did not confine itself to indignant and vehement invectives against his overweening ambition, severity and imperiousness; there is no epithet of scorn or debasement, no imaginable charge of venality, rapacity, cruelty, or even licentiousness, which is not heaped upon him, and that even by bishops of the opposite party.¹ The wilful promoting of unnatural sins is retorted by the married clergy on the assertor of clerical chastity; even his austere personal virtue does not place him above calumny; his intimate alliance with the Countess Matilda, the profound devotion of that lofty female to her spiritual Father, his absolute command over her mind is attributed at one time to criminal intercourse,² at another to magic.

¹ That which in the poetical invective (I am ashamed to abuse the word poetry) of Benzo, apud Menckenium, p. 975 (be it observed a bishop), takes the coarsest and plainest form, is noticed also by the grave Lambert of Herzfeld.

² *Hæc est mulier illa, de qua ab obtrectatoribus fidei et consultatoribus*

Even at the time at which Hildebrand was thus declaring war against the empire, and precipitating the inevitable conflict for supremacy over the world, he was not safe in Rome. It cannot be known whether Gilbert of Parma, the Archbishop of Ravenna, the representative of the imperial interests in Italy, who in Rome had opposed all that he dared—a sullen and dissembled resistance to the Pope—was privy to the daring enterprise of Cencius. That leader and descendant of the old turbulent barons of Romagna had old scores of vengeance to repay against Hildebrand, the adviser of that policy which had brought down the Normans for their subjugation.

Cencius had been master of the castle of St. Angelo, and the master of the castle of St. Angelo was an important partisan for the Pope. The Normans might now seem to have done their work; for some offence they were excommunicated in their turn by the fearless Gregory; the Counts of Tusculum were to be the protectors of the Roman See. But Cencius was after-

veritatis crimen incestus sancto Pontifici objiciebatur.—Hugon. Chron. apud Pertz, x. p. 462. His defenders, singularly enough, think it necessary to appeal to miracle to explain this domination of a powerful and religious mind like Hildebrand's, over perhaps a weakly religious one like Matilda's. This scandal appears in its grossest and most particular form in Cosmas of Prague, who adds, "*hæc sufficit breviter dixisse, quæ utinam non dixissem.*" Apud Menckenium, p. 39. The age of one of the two might be enough to contradict those foul tales; if they were worth contradiction. Yet was the charge publicly made in the address of the German Bishops in the Synod at Mentz. Thus writes a Bishop. *Qui etiam fœtore quodam gravissimi scandali totam ecclesiam replesti de conventu et cohabitatione alienæ mulieris familiariori, quam necesse est. In quâ re verecundia nostra magis quam causa laborat, quamvis hæc generalis querela ubique personuerit omnia judicia omnia decreta per feminas in sede apostolicâ actuari denique per fœminas totum orbem ecclesiæ administrari.* Udalrici Cod. apud Eccard. ii. p. 172. I believe this as little as the incests, violation of nuns and virgins charged by one or two writers against Henry.

wards suspected of dealings with the excommunicated Guibert. He was attacked and taken; the castle of St. Angelo for a time dismantled; the life of Cencius was spared only on the merciful intervention of the Countess Matilda.¹ Cencius therefore had long arrears of revenge; success would make him an ally who might dictate his own terms to those who had a common interest in the degradation of Gregory. Master of the Pope's person, he might expect not merely not to be disowned, but to claim whatever reward might be demanded by his ambition.

On the eve of Christmas-day the rain had poured down in torrents. The Romans remained ^{A.D. 1075.} in their houses; the Pope, with but a few ^{Pope seized by Cencius.} ecclesiastics, was keeping the holy vigil in the remote church of Santa Maria Maggiore. The wild night suited the wild purpose of Cencius. The Pope was in the act of administering the Holy Communion, when a fierce shout of triumph and a shriek of terror sounded through the church. The soldiers of Cencius burst in, swept along the nave, dashed down the rails, rushed to the altar, and seized the Pontiff. One fatal blow might have ended the life of Hildebrand and changed the course of human events; it glanced aside, and only wounded his forehead. Bleeding, stripped of his holy vestments, but patient and gentle, the Pope made no resistance; he was dragged away, mounted behind one of the soldiers, and imprisoned in a strong tower.² The rumor ran rapidly through the city; all the night, trumpets pealed, bells tolled. The clergy ^{Rescue.} who were officiating in the different churches broke off

¹ Cencius, according to Lambert, had been excommunicated by the Pope.

² Bonizo.

their services, and ran about the streets summoning the populace to rescue and revenge ; soldiers rushed to the gates to prevent the prisoner from being carried out of the town. At the dawn of morn the people assembled in the Capitol, ignorant whether the Pope was dead or alive. When the place of his imprisonment was known, they thronged to the siege ; engines were brought from all quarters ; the tottering walls began to yield. Cencius shuddered at his own deed. One faithful friend and one noble matron had followed the Pope into his dungeon. The man had covered his shivering body with furs, and was cherishing his chilled feet in his own bosom ; the woman had stanchd the blood, had bound up the wound in his head, and sat weeping beside him. Cencius, cowardly as cruel, had no course left but to throw himself at the feet of the Pontiff, and to implore his mercy. In the most humiliating language he confessed his sins, his sacrilege, his impiety. The Pope, thus insulted, thus wounded, thus hardly escaped from a miserable death, maintained throughout the mild dignity and self-command of a Christian Pontiff. His wisdom might indeed lead him to dread the despair of a ruffian. “Thine injuries against myself I freely pardon. Thy sins against God, against his mother, his apostles, and his whole Church, must be expiated. Go on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and if thou returnest alive, present thyself to us, and be reconciled with God. As thou hast been an example of sin, so be thou of repentance !” Christ himself might seem to be speaking in his Vicegerent.¹

Gregory was brought out ; he made a motion to the

¹ Paul. Bernried, Vit. Greg. Lambert, Berthold sub ann. 1076. Arnulf, v. 6, apud Pertz. Bonizo. Lib. ad Amic.

people to arrest the fury with which they were rushing to storm the tower ; it was mistaken for a sign of distress. They broke down, they clambered over, the walls. Gregory, yet stained with blood, stood in the midst of his deliverers ; he was carried in triumph to the church from which he had been dragged, finished the service, and returned to the Lateran. Cencius and his kindred fled ; their houses and towers were razed by the indignant populace.

This adventure showed to Hildebrand at once his danger and his strength. It was not the signal for, it was rather simultaneous with, the final and irreparable breach with the King — a breach which, however, had been preparing for some months. Guibert of Ravenna was allowed to depart unquestioned, if not unsuspected as the secret author of this outrage, suspicions which were not lightened by one of his acts which took place some time after — the burial of Cencius, which he celebrated with great magnificence in Pavia. But even against Guibert Hildebrand now countenanced no such charge, still less against Henry himself. Noth- Jan. 8.

ing of the kind is intimated in the letter addressed but two weeks after to the King of Germany, which, if not the direct declaration of war, was the sullen murmuring of the thunder before the storm.

It is important carefully to observe the ground which Hildebrand took in that manifesto of war, of war disguised under the words of reconcilia- ^{Letter to King Henry.} tion : whether the lofty moral assertion that he was placed on high to rebuke the unchristian acts of kings, or even to assert the liberties of their oppressed subjects ; or the lower, the questionable right to confer

benefices ; and the King's disobedience in ecclesiastical matters to the See of Rome.¹

“ Deeply and anxiously weighing the responsibilities of the trust committed to us by St. Peter, we have with great hesitation granted our apostolic benediction, for it is reported that thou still holdest communion with excommunicated persons. If this be true, the grace of that benediction avails thee nothing. Seek ghostly counsel of some sage priest, and perform the penance imposed upon thee.” He proceeds to reprove the King for the hypocritical submissiveness of his letters, and the disobedience of his conduct. The grant of the archbishopric of Milan without waiting the decision of the apostolic see ; the investiture of the bishoprics of Fermo and Spoleto made to persons unknown to the Pope, were acts of irreverence to St. Peter and his successor. “ The apostolic synod over which we presided this year, thought fit in the decay of the Christian religion to revert to the ancient discipline of the Church, that discipline on which depends the salvation of man. This decree (however some may presume to call it an insupportable burden or intolerable oppression) we esteem a necessary law ; all Christian kings and people are bound directly to accept and to observe it. As thou art the highest in dignity and power, so shouldest thou surpass others in devotion to Christ. If, however, thou didst consider this abrogation of a bad custom hard or unjust to thyself, thou shouldest have sent to our presence some of the wisest and most religious of thy realm, to persuade us, in our condescension, to mitigate its

¹ This missive must have been received early in January, when Henry was at Goslar. — Stenzel, *in loc.*

force in some way not inconsistent with the honor of God and the salvation of men's souls. We exhort thee, in our parental love, to prefer the honor of Christ to thine own, and to give full liberty to the Church, the Spouse of God." Hildebrand then alludes to the victory of Henry over the Saxons, with significant reference to the fate of Saul, whom success in war led into fatal impiety.

The date of this letter, when written, and when received, is not absolutely certain ;¹ it was coupled with or immediately followed by a peremptory summons to Henry to appear in Rome to answer for all his offences before the tribunal of the Pope, and before a synod of ecclesiastics ; if he should refuse or delay, he was at once to suffer the sentence of excommunication. The 22d of February was the day appointed for his appearance.

Henry summoned to Rome on Feb. 22.

Thus the King, the victorious king of the Germans, was solemnly cited as a criminal to answer undefined charges, to be amenable to laws which the judge had assumed the right of enacting, interpreting, enforcing by the last penalties. The whole affairs of the empire were to be suspended while the King stood before the bar of his imperious arbiter ; no delay was allowed ; the stern and immutable alternative was humble and instant obedience, or that sentence which involved deposition from the Empire, eternal perdition.²

In this desperate emergency one course alone seemed

¹ It is dated by Jaffe Jan. 8.

² Aderant præterea Hildebrandi Papæ legati, denunciante Regi, ut secundâ feriâ secundæ hebdomadæ in quadragesimâ ad synodum Romæ occurreret, de criminibus quæ objicerentur, causam dicturus: alioquin sciret se absque omni procrastinatione eodem die de corpore sanctæ ecclesiæ apostolico anathemate abscindendum esse. — Lambert.

left open. In Germany the idea of the temporal sovereign was but vague, indistinct, and limited; he was but the head of an assemblage of independent princes, his powers, if not legally, actually bounded by his ability to enforce obedience. The Cæsar was but an imposing and magnificent title, which Teutonic pride gloried in having appropriated to its sovereign, but against which the old Teutonic independence opposed a strong, often invincible resistance. The idea of the Pope was an integral part of German Christianity; dread of excommunication part of the faith, to question which was a bold act of infidelity.

It was only then by invalidating the title of the individual Pope that he could be lawfully resisted, or his authority shaken in the minds of the multitude. It was a daring determination, but it was the only determination to which Henry and his ecclesiastical counsellors could well have recourse, to depose a pope who had thus declared war, even to the death, against him. Not a day was to be lost; if the Pope were still Pope on the fatal 22nd of February, the irrevocable excommunication would be passed. The legates who brought this denunciatory message were dismissed with ignominy. Messengers were despatched with breathless haste to
A.D. 1076. summon the prelates of Germany to meet at the faithful city of Worms, on Septuagesima Sunday, January 24th. After the death of Hanno of Cologne, Henry, knowing too well the danger of that princely see in able hands, had forced into it a monk named Hildorf, of obscure birth, insignificant in person, feeble in mind.

On the appointed day, besides the secular partisans

of Henry, the bishops and abbots of Germany ^{Synod of Worms.} obeyed the royal summons in great numbers. Siegfried of Mentz¹ took his seat as president of the synod. Cardinal Hugo the White, the same man who had taken the lead in the election of Hildebrand, and commended him by the glowing panegyric on his virtues to the Roman people, came forward, no doubt, as pretending to represent the clergy of Rome, and arraigned Pope Gregory before the synod as the worst and wickedest of men. His extravagant and monstrous charges dwelt on the early life of Gregory, on the bribery and violence by which he had gained the Papacy, the licentiousness, the flagitiousness of his life as Pope, his cruelty, his necromancy. He demanded the deposition of Gregory VII. With loud unanimous acclamation the synod declared that a man guilty of such crimes (crimes of which no shadow of proof was adduced, and which rested on the assertion of one himself excommunicated, it was averred, for simony) had forfeited the power of binding and loosing, he was no longer Pope. The renunciation of allegiance was drawn up in the strictest and most explicit form. "I, * * * bishop of * * *, disclaim from this hour all subjection and allegiance to Hildebrand, and will neither esteem nor call him Pope." Two bishops only, Adelbert of Wurtzburg and Herman of Metz, hesitated to sign this paper. They argued that it was unjust and uncanonical to condemn a bishop without a general council, without accusers and defenders, and without communicating the charges against him, how much more a pope, against whom the accusation of a bishop, or even an archbishop, was not valid. But William of Utrecht, the boldest,

¹ He had been degraded by the Pope. — Lambert, sub ann.

the most learned, and the staunchest partisan of Henry, offered them the alternative of disclaiming their allegiance to the King, or affixing their signature. To this force they yielded an unwilling approbation.¹

The letter of Henry to the Pope, conveying the decree of the council, was couched in the most
Letter to the Pope announcing his deposition. arrogant and insulting terms, and so neutralized the bitter truths which, more calmly expressed, might have wrought on impartial minds, if such there were. “Henry, not by usurpation, but by God’s ordinance, King, to Hildebrand, no longer Pope, but the false monk.” It accused him of the haughtiness with which he tyrannized over every order of the Church, and had trampled archbishops, bishops, the whole clergy, under his feet. He had pretended to universal knowledge as to universal power. “By the authority of the priesthood, thou hast even threatened to deprive us of our royal authority, that priesthood to which thou wast never called by Christ.” “By craft thou hast got money, by money influence, by influence the power of the sword; by the sword thou hast mounted the throne of peace, and from the throne of peace destroyed peace, arming subjects against their rulers, bringing bishops appointed by God into contempt, and exposing them to the judgment of the laity. Us too, consecrated of God, amenable to no judge but God, who can be deposed for no crime but absolute apostasy, thou hast ventured to assail, despising the words of that true pope St. Peter, ‘Fear God! honor the King!’ Thou that honorest

¹ The Chronicle of Hildesheim says that the bishop of that city signed only from fear of death, *sed quod scripserat, ut homo sagacissimi ingenii obelo supposito damnavit*. This bishop stood on dangerous ground as a leader in the Saxon insurrection.

not the King fearest not God! St. Paul held accursed even an angel from heaven who should preach another Gospel: this curse falls upon thee who teachest this new doctrine." "Thus accursed then, thus condemned by the sentence of all our bishops, and by our own, down! Leave the apostolic throne which thou hast usurped. Let another take the chair of St. Peter, one who preaches not violence and war, but the sound doctrine of the holy Apostle. I, Henry, by the grace of God King, with all the bishops of my realm, say unto thee, 'Down! down!'"

Another letter was addressed to the clergy and people of Rome. In this the King accuses the Pope of having sworn to deprive him of the ^{To clergy and people of Rome.} kingdom of Italy. "Gregory would hazard his own life, or strip the King of his life and kingdom." As patrician, therefore, Henry had deposed the Pope, and now commands them on their allegiance to rise up against him. "Be the most loyal the first to join in his condemnation. We do not ask you to shed his blood; let him suffer life, which, after he is deposed, will be more wretched to him than death; but if he resist, compel him to yield up the apostolic throne, and make way for one whom we shall elect, who will have both the will and the power to heal the wounds inflicted on the Church by their present pastor."

The German Church seemed to enter into the bold and open revolt of Henry; in Lombardy the old party of Cadalous and of the married clergy, maintained and guided by Guibert of Ravenna, ^{Early in February.} showed equal resolution. A synod at Piacenza ratified the decree of Worms.

Gregory in the mean time had summoned his third

Lateran Council. Feb. 21, 22, 1076. council in the Lateran. He sat among his assembled bishops. The hymn had ceased which implored the descent of the Holy Ghost on this great Christian assembly. The bold and sudden entrance of Roland, a priest of Parma, was hardly perceived amid the grave occupation to which (as genuine descendants of the old Romans, who, when the fate of kings and nations depended on their vote, usually commenced their solemn council by consulting the augurs, and waiting for some significant omen) they had surrendered their absorbed attention. An egg had been found which, by its mysterious form, portended the issue of the conflict. What seemed a black serpent, the type of evil, rose as it were in high relief, and coiled around the smooth shell; but it had struck on what seemed a shield, and recoiled, bruised and twisting in a mortal agony. On this sight sate gazing the mute ecclesiastical senate.¹

But the voice of Roland made itself heard. "The King and the bishops of Germany send this mandate. Down at once from the throne of St. Peter! yield up the usurped government of the Roman Church! none must presume to such honor but those chosen by the general voice and approved by the Emperor." He turned to the amazed assembly — "Ye, my brethren,

¹ Incipiens synodum pastor Gregorius, ovum
Gallinæ sculptum, gestans in cortice scutum
Et colubrum nigrum qui tendebat caput, ictu
Quippe reperiussus quodam, pertingere sursum
Non potuit, caudamque plicans dabat sinuatam.
Non erat hæc plana, sed erat sculptura levata.
Ad synodum fertur, nunquam par ante repertum
Quod dum miratur, prædictus et ecce Robertus * * *

DONIZO.

This, be it remembered, is history, not poetry. Robert is called elsewhere Roland.

are commanded to present yourselves at the Feast of Pentecost before the King my master, there to receive a Pope and Father ; for this man is no Pope, but a ravening wolf."

The fiery Bishop of Porto sprang from his seat and shouted with a loud voice, "Seize him !" Cencius, the governor of the city,¹ and his soldiers sprang forth to hew the audacious envoy in pieces. Gregory interposed his own person, protected the King's ambassador, and with difficulty restored order. He received the documents presented by Roland, and with his wonted calm dignity, read the acts of the councils, with the taunting letter of the King.

Murmurs of vehement indignation burst from the whole synod ; they sank again as Gregory commenced his address, urging them to respect the sanctity of the place. In his speech, skilfully it may hardly be said, yet naturally, his own cause was assumed to be that of the clergy, of the Church, of Christianity. "These were the coming and predicted days in which it behoved the clergy to show the innocence of the dove, blended with the wisdom of the serpent. The forerunner of Anti-Christ had risen against the Church ; the dry harvest was about to be wet with the blood of the saints. Now is the time when it will be shown who is ashamed of his Lord, of whom the Lord will be ashamed at his second coming. Better is it to die for Christ and his holy laws, than, by shamefully yielding to those who violate and trample them under foot, to be traitors to the Church : not to resist such impious men were to de-

¹ Stephen Cencius, another of the same family, according to Bonizo, brother of the famous Cencius, a partisan of the Pope. He was afterwards put to a cruel death by the Imperialists. — Bonizo, p. 816.

ny the faith of Christ.” With the gravity of an ancient augur he proceeded to interpret the sign of the egg. The serpent was the dragon of the Apocalypse raging against the Church; and in the same old Roman spirit he drew the omen of victory from its discomfiture. “Now, therefore, brethren, it behoves us to draw the sword of vengeance; now must we smite the foe of God and of his Church; now shall his bruised head, which lifts itself in its haughtiness against the foundation of the faith and of all the Churches, fall to the earth; there, according to the sentence pronounced against his pride, to go upon his belly, and eat the dust. Fear not, little flock, saith the Lord, for it is the will of your Father to grant you the kingdom. Long enough have ye borne with him; often enough have ye admonished him: let his seared conscience be made at length to feel!”

The whole synod replied with one voice, “Let thy wisdom, most holy Father, whom the divine mercy has raised up to rule the world in our days, utter such a sentence against this blasphemer, this usurper, this tyrant, this apostate, as may crush him to the earth, and make him a warning to future ages. . . . Draw the sword, pass the judgment, *that the righteous may rejoice when he seeth the vengeance, and wash his hands in the blood of the ungodly.*”¹

The formal sentence was delayed, to prepare it in more awful terms, till the next day. On the morning arrived letters from many prelates and nobles of Ger-

¹ Psalm lviii. 10. Paul Bernried, the fullest authority on this period, gives the whole as the proceedings of one day. Other writers seem to show that they occupied two; but the distribution of the business between these two days is somewhat conjectural.

many and Italy, disclaiming the acts of the synods at Worms and Piacenza, and imploring the forgiveness of the Pope for their enforced assent to these decrees. The Pontiff again took his seat in the Lateran, encircled by 110 bishops and abbots. The first sentence fell on Siegfried of Mentz, and the prelates who had concurred in the proceedings at Worms. They were suspended from their episcopal functions, interdicted from the holy Eucharist, unless in the hour of death, and after due and accepted penance. Those who had assented from compulsion were allowed time to make their peace with the apostolic see. The prelates who met at Piacenza were condemned to the same punishment. Some other censures were spoken against other prelates and nobles of the empire; but the awe-struck assembly awaited in eager expectation that against the arch-criminal, King Henry. The Empress Agnes was among the audience; the stern stoicism of the monastic life had even wrought a mother's heart to listen to the sentence, perhaps of eternal damnation, against her son.¹

Hildebrand commenced his sentence with an address to St. Peter, and renewed protestations of the reluctance against which he had been com-^{Henry} pelled to ascend the pontifical throne. ^{deposed.} "In full confidence in the authority over all Christian people, granted by God to the delegate of St. Peter," "for the honor and defence of the Church, in the name of the Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and by the power and authority of St. Peter, I interdict King Henry, son of Henry the Emperor, who in his unexampled pride has risen against the Church, from the gov-

¹ Berthold, p. 283.

ernment of the whole realm of Germany and of Italy. I absolve all Christians from the oaths which they have sworn or may swear to him; and forbid all obedience to him as King. For it is just that he who impugns the honor of the Church, should himself forfeit all the honor which he seems to have; and because he has scorned the obedience of a Christian, nor returned to the Lord, from whom he had revolted by holding communion with the excommunicate, by committing many iniquities, and despising the admonitions, which, as thou knowest, I have given him for his salvation, and has separated himself from the Church by creating schism: I bind him, therefore, in thy name, in the bonds of thy anathema; that all the nations may know and may acknowledge that thou art Peter, that upon thy rock the Son of the living God has built his Church, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”¹

When the Senate or the Emperors of Rome issued their mandates to the extremity of the world, they were known to be supported by vast and irresistible armies.

¹ For the modern views on the subject of deposing kings, see perhaps the ablest work, Gosselin, *Pouvoir du Pape au Moyen Age*. The foundation of Fenelon's theory, embraced partially by M. de Maistre, fully by M. Gosselin, is, that the Pope's power of dethroning sovereigns rested on a “droit public,” acknowledged throughout Europe. But whence this droit public, but from the exaggerated claims of the Pope and the clergy, beaten by superstitious terrors into the minds of men? The whole argument of Gosselin's book is, that the power existed and was acknowledged, therefore it was absolute law. De Maistre has said that possession on one hand, consent (assentiment) on the other, is the foundation of all power; but what tyranny does not this justify and eternize? The first premise nobody will deny in one sense; and we even may admit the conclusion, so far as it may mitigate the attributing the growth of such principles to deliberate, far-seeing, conscious ambition on the part of the clergy and the Pope; but it will not absolve them from having been unconsciously influenced by the desire of corporate or personal aggrandizement, or from their abuse of those principles, when admitted, by making them subservient to their own passions and to their own temporal ends.

The mandates of Hildebrand were to promulgate, to execute themselves. He was master, indeed, in Rome; he might depend, perhaps, on the support of his ally, the Countess Matilda; he might possibly, as a last refuge, summon the Normans, an uncertain trust, to his succor. But on these things he seemed to disdain to waste a thought; on himself, on his censures, on the self-assumed righteousness of his cause, on the fears of men, and doubtless on what he believed the pledged and covenanted protection of the Saints, of Christ, of God, he calmly relied for what he would not doubt would be his final triumph.

King Henry heard in Utrecht, March 27, the sentence of the Pope. His first impression was that of dismay; but he soon recovered himself, affected to treat it with contempt, and determined to revenge himself by the excommunication of the Pope. The Measures of Henry.

Bishops of Toul and Verdun, though attached to Henry, had disapproved of the condemnation of the Pope; they secretly withdrew from the city to escape the perilous office now demanded of them. In William of Utrecht fidelity to the king had grown into a fierce hatred of the Pope. Not merely did he utter the sentence of excommunication, but followed it up with busy zeal. At every opportunity, even when performing the sacred office, he broke forth against the perjurer, the adulterer, the false apostle; and pronounced him excommunicated, not by himself alone, but William of Utrecht excommunicates the Pope. by all the bishops of Germany.¹ Nor was April. William absolutely alone; a council at Pavia, summoned by the indefatigable Guibert, met and anathematized Gregory.

¹ Omnibus pæne diebus solemnitur, rabido ore declamavit. — Lambert.

But while these vain thunders had no effect on the rigid churchmen and the laity who adhered to the Pope, the excommunication of Henry was working in the depths of the German mind, and mingling itself up with, and seeming to hallow, all the other motives for jealousy, hatred, and revenge, which prevailed in so many parts of the empire. A vast and formidable conspiracy began to organize itself, hardly in secret. The Dukes Rudolph of Swabia, Guelf of Bavaria, Berthold of Carinthia, with the Bishops of Wurzburg and Metz, were at the head of the league, which comprehended men knew not whom, there was no one whom it might
 April 28. not comprehend. The King summoned a diet at Worms, but the prudent, and those conscious of sinister designs, kept away: it separated without coming to any conclusion. A second was summoned for St. Peter's day, to meet at Mentz.

But even before the diet at Worms an event had taken place which had appalled all Germany — the sudden death of William of Utrecht. Terri-
 Death of William of Utrecht. ble rumors of the circumstances of his fate spread throughout the land, darkening, no doubt, as they went on. In the delirium of his mortal sickness he had reproached himself for his wicked and impious conduct to the Pope, entreated his attendants not to weary themselves with fruitless prayers for a soul irrecoverably lost. He had died, it was said, without the Holy Communion. The blasphemer of Hildebrand had perished in an agony of despair; and God had not only pronounced his awful vengeance against the blasphemer himself, the cathedral which had witnessed the ceremony of Gregory's excommunication had been struck by the lightning of heaven.

Even after death the terrible power of Gregory pursued William of Utrecht. In answer to an inquiry of the Bishop of Liege, the Pope sternly replied, that, if William of Utrecht had knowingly communicated with the excommunicated Henry (and of this fact and of his impenitence there could be no doubt), the inexorable interdict must follow him beyond the grave. Unabsolved he lived and died, there was no absolution after death; no prayers, no sacrifices, no alms could be offered for the soul of William of Utrecht.¹

Henry looked abroad into the Empire, which, but the year before, his victory at Hohenburg had awed at least into outward peace, and where the obsequious clergy at Worms had seemed to join him almost with unanimity in his defiance of Hildebrand. On every side he now saw hostility, avowed or secret, conspiracy, desertion; the princes meditating revolt; the prelates either openly renouncing or shaken in their allegiance. Herman of Metz had released some of the Saxon chieftains committed to his charge; he was evidently assuming the rank of head of the Hildebrandine party among the ecclesiastics of Germany. Henry had threatened to revenge himself by marching at once and occupying Metz, but had been obliged to abandon that decisive measure. The defection of Otho of Nordheim, to whom the final suppression of the Saxon rebellion had been entrusted, and who at least had listened to the overtures of the insurgents, was still more embarrassing, and broke up all his warlike plans.

At Mentz the assembly both of prelates and nobles

¹ Regest. iv. 6. Godfrey of Lorraine too had fallen by the hands of murderers in Friesland.

May 15.
Died at
Mentz.

was more numerous than at the second assembly summoned at Worms; but the leaders of the opposition whom Henry hoped either to gain or to overawe, and whose attendance, sinking from the imperious language of command, he had condescended to implore, still kept aloof, and, without declaration of hostility, maintained a sullen but menacing neutrality. Yet enough appeared at the Diet to show the dreadful effects to be apprehended from the approaching conflict, and the nature of the resistance which was to be encountered by the King. Throughout Germany house was divided against house, family against family, kindred against kindred. Udo, Archbishop of Treves, the third of the great Rhenish prelates, had passed the Alps to make his peace with Gregory; he had been received with courtesy, and had yielded himself up absolutely to the spell of Hildebrand's commanding mind. His conduct on his return was sufficiently expressive. With cold determination he refused to hold any intercourse with his brother metropolitans, the excommunicated Siegfried and Hildorf of Cologne, and with the other bishops of Henry's party. Only by the express permission of the Pope would he venture into the infected presence of the excommunicated King himself, in order to give him good counsel. He shrank from the sin and contamination of eating with him or joining him in prayer. The contagion of fear and aversion spread into the palace of Henry. The ecclesiastics shrank away one by one, lest they should be defiled by the royal intercourse. To the King's repeated commands, to his earnest entreaties that they would return, they answered that it was better to lose the royal favor than endanger their souls.¹ The more ardent and resolute of Henry's party

¹ Lambert, sub ann.

were excited to the utmost fury ; they urged the King to draw at once the sword, committed to him by God, to chastise the rebellious prelates and his other contumacious subjects.

But Henry felt the ebbing away of his strength. Every thing seemed blasted with a curse and turned against him. His last hold on the fears of the Saxons was that he still had in his power some of their more formidable leaders. He issued orders to use the utmost vigilance for their detention. Of these the most dangerous, and, as most dangerous, most hateful to Henry was Burchard, Bishop of Halberstadt, whom Henry determined to send to Hungary for safer cus-

Escape and
liberation of
Saxon pri-
soners.
June 24.

tody. On his descent of the Danube a bold and adventurous partisan contrived the liberation of the bishop : Burchard found his way to Saxony. The King's measures began to be those of a man in utter despair, wild, inconsistent, passionate. He at once changed his policy. He determined to have the merit of granting freedom to those whom he could not hope to detain in prison. To the bishops of Magdeburg, Merseburg, and Meissen, to Duke Magnus and the Palatine Frederick, he sent word that, though by the laws of the empire he would be justified in putting them to death, yet out of respect for their exalted rank, he would not merely release them on the promise of their fidelity, but reward that fidelity with the utmost liberality. They met hypocrisy with hypocrisy, and solemnly swore fidelity. They were brought to Mentz to receive their liberation from Henry himself ; but he was defeated even in this measure.¹ A fray took place in the city be-

June 29.

tween the followers of the Bishop of Bamberg and of a

¹ Lambert, sub ann.; Benzo, 33-36.

rival ecclesiastic ; the prisoners escaped in the confusion.

An expedition into Saxony, through Bohemia, ended July. in total and disgraceful failure. The King, instead of quelling his rebellious subjects, only by good fortune effected an ignominious retreat, and fled to Worms.

Hildebrand in the mean time neglected none of his own means of warfare, that warfare conducted not in the battle-field, but in the hearts and souls of men, which he felt himself to command, and knew how to sway to his purpose. Words were his weapons, but words which went to the depths of the human mind, and shook almost every living man with fear. There were two classes, the churchmen, and the vulgar, which comprehended the larger part of the human race ; to both he spake the fit and persuasive language. He addressed a spiritual manifesto to all Christendom, but more especially to the bishops and clergy. He reverted to his former affection for Henry ; the love with which even when a deacon he had warned his youth ; he had continued his earnest admonitions in mature age. But Henry had only returned evil for good ; had lifted up his heel against St. Peter. He commanded the bishops to urge the contumacious King to repentance, but “ if he prefers the devil to Christ, and adheres to his simoniacal and excommunicated counselors, the bishops, the Pope himself, must manfully discharge their duty. They must enforce upon all, clergy and laity, the peremptory obligation of avoiding all intercourse whatever with the excommunicated ; all intercourse which was death to the souls of those wretched men and to their own.” ¹

¹ Regest, iv. 1.

In a letter to Herman of Metz he presses this doctrine with more relentless rigor. “All who had communicated with the excommunicated king, if king he might be called, by that act had themselves incurred excommunication.” Such were the doctrines of him who assumed to represent the Prince of Peace! “But there were those who denied his right to excommunicate a king: though their folly deserved it not, he would condescend to answer.”¹ What then was his answer? One of the most audacious fictions of the Decretals; an extract from a charge delivered by St. Peter to Clement of Rome; the deposition of Childebert by Pope Zacharias; certain sentences of Gregory the Great intended to protect the estates of the Church, and anathematizing all, even kings, who should usurp them; finally the memorable example of St. Ambrose and Theodosius the Great. “Why is the King alone excepted from that universal flock committed to the guardianship of St. Peter? If the Pope may judge spiritual persons, how much more must secular persons give an account of their evil deeds before his tribunal? Think they that the royal excels the episcopal dignity? — the former the invention of human pride, the latter of divine holiness: the former ever coveting vain glory, the latter aspiring after heavenly life. ‘The glory of a king,’ St. Ambrose says, ‘to that of a bishop is as lead to gold.’ Constantine the Great took his seat below the lowest bishop, for he knew that God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble.” — The humility of Hildebrand! He then peremptorily forbade all bishops to presume to grant absolution to Henry, or to enter into communion with him. “The consecration

¹ Licet pro magnâ fatuitate nec etiam eis respondere debemus.

of a bishop who communicates with the excommunicate is an execration.”

A third letter, to the German people, commanded
 Sept. 3. them, if the King did not immediately repent, dismiss his evil counsellors, acknowledge that the Church was not subject to him as a handmaid, but superior as a mistress, and abandon those usages which had been established in the spirit of pride against the liberty of the holy Church (the investiture), to proceed at once to the election of a new sovereign, a sovereign approved by the Pope. He anticipates the embarrassment of their oath sworn to the Empress Agnes. She, no doubt, when Henry shall be deposed, will give her consent; the Pope would absolve them from their oath.

The diet met at Tribur near Darmstadt. Thither
 Oct. 16. came Rudolph of Swabia, Otho of Saxony, Guelf of Bavaria, the two former rivals for the throne if it should be vacant by the deposition of Henry. All the old enemies, all the revolted friends, the bishops who had opposed, the bishops who had consented, some even who had advised his lofty demeanor towards the Pope, appeared drawn together by their ambition, by their desire of liberty or of power, by their fears and by their hopes of gain or advancement, by their conscientious churchmanship, or their base resolution to be on the stronger side. Already in Ulm, where the diet at Tribur had been agreed upon, Otho of Constance had made
 In September. his peace with the Church; the feeble Siegfried of Mentz did the same. The Bishops of Verdun, Strasburg, Liege, Munster, and Utrecht obtained easier absolution, some of them having from the first disapproved of the King's proceedings.

The legates of the Pope, Sighard Patriarch of Aqu-

leia, and Altman Bishop of Passau, whose life had been endangered in the suppression of the married clergy, with many laymen of rank who had embraced the monastic life, appeared to vindicate the Pope's right to excommunicate the King, and to sanction the election of a new sovereign. These men kept themselves in severe seclusion from all who, since his excommunication, had held the slightest intercourse by word or deed with the King. They avoided with equal abhorrence all who communicated, even in prayer, with married or simoniacal clergy.

For seven days the conclave sat in high and independent, and undisturbed deliberation on the crimes of the Emperor ; the sins of his youth, ^{Diet at Tribur.} by which he had disgraced the majesty of the Empire ; the injuries which he had inflicted on individuals and on the public weal ; his devotion to base-born counselors, and his deliberate hostility to the nobles of the realm ; his having left the frontiers open to barbarous enemies, while he was waging cruel war on his subjects ; the state of the Empire which he had inherited flourishing in peace and wealth, but which was now in the most wretched condition, laid waste by civil wars ; the destruction of churches and monasteries and the confiscation of their estates for the maintenance of a lawless army ; and the building fortresses to reduce his free-born liegemen to slavery : widows and orphans were without protection ; the oppressed and calumniated without refuge ; the laws had lost their authority, manners their discipline, the Church her power, the State her dignity. Thus by the recklessness of one man things sacred and profane, divine and human, right and wrong, were in confusion and anarchy. For these

great calamities one remedy alone remained, the election of another king, who should restrain the general license, and bear the weight of the tottering world. The right of the Pope to separate the King from the communion of the faithful was fully recognized; even if the Pope had passed such sentence unjustly, no Christian could communicate with the interdicted person till reconciled to the Church.

On the other side of the Rhine, at Oppenheim, the
Henry at
Oppenheim. deserted Henry, with a few armed followers, a very few faithful nobles, and still fewer bishops, kept his diminished and still dwindling court. The Rhine flowed between these strangely contrasted assemblies. The vigor of Henry's character seemed crushed by the universal defection. There was no dignity in his humiliation. Even with his imperfect sense of kingly duty, and his notions of kingly power, the terrible truth of some of these accusations may have depressed his conscience. Whatever his offences against the Pope, he could not wonder at the alienation of his subjects. He sank to abject submission. Day after day came his messengers offering concession on concession, the redress of all grievances, the amendment of all errors, the promise to efface by his future benefits the memory of all past injuries. He was ready to do no public act without consulting the great Council of the realm; he would even surrender up his power, place the government in other hands, if they would leave him the royal name and dignity, which could not be taken away without degrading the crown of Germany in the eyes of men. For the fulfilment of these terms he offered any oaths and any hostages demanded by the Diet.

The conclave coldly replied that they could have no faith in his promises ; on every favorable opportunity he had broken like spiders' webs, the solemn oaths which he had pledged before God. They had been patient too long. Their religious reverence for their allegiance had made them endure the dissolution of all order in the state, the loss of peace in all the churches of the realm, the majesty of the empire subverted, the dignity of the public morals debased, the laws suspended, the ruin of justice and piety. As long as his temporal life was concerned, they had borne all this out of respect for their oath of fealty ; but now that he was cut off by the sentence of the Pope from the Church of God, it would be madness not to seize the hour of deliverance. It was their fixed determination, therefore, without delay to provide " a man to go before them, and to wage the war of the Lord," to the destruction of his pride who had lifted himself against the justice and truth of God and the authority of the Roman Church.

The treacherous Archbishop of Mentz had given orders to collect all the boats upon the Rhine, in order to attack Henry at Oppenheim, to seize his person, disperse his followers, and by one decisive blow to end the contest. But the partisans of Henry and Henry himself drew courage from the desperate state of their affairs. They boldly manned the shores, and bade defiance to their enemies. The confederates shrank from the conflict ; some were not prepared for the last extremity of arms ; others, remembering Hohenburg, might dread the issue of a battle even at such advantage. But this was a transient gleam of courage and success ; the consciousness of his weakness returned ; Henry was at the mercy of his revolted subjects. He had but to

accept the hard terms which they might be pleased to impose. The terms were these: the whole affair was to be reserved for the decision of the supreme Pontiff, who was to hold a council at Augsburg on the feast of the Purification in the ensuing year. In the mean time Henry was to declare his unreserved subjection and submission to the Pope, to dismiss his army, and live as a private man at Spires, with no ensigns of royalty, performing no act of kingly authority, not presuming to enter a church, and holding no intercourse with his excommunicated counsellors. He was to deliver the city of Worms to its bishop, to disband the garrison, and to bind the citizens by an oath to commit no act of insult or rebellion against their prelate. If the King was not absolved from the ban of excommunication before the full year expired from the date of his sentence (in that same month of February in which fell the feast of the Purification), he forfeited irrevocably all right and title to the throne; his subjects were released from their allegiance.

Henry bowed his head before his fate. He dismissed his counsellors; the Bishops of Cologne, Strasbourg, Bamberg, Basle, Spires, Lausanne, Zeitz, and Osnaburg were left to make their peace as they could with the Pope. Even his favorite counts, Ulric of Cosheim, and Eberhard of Nellenburg, were obliged to depart. He disbanded his troops, yielded up faithful Worms to its triumphant bishop, retired to Spires, and he who had been born, as it were, a king, who could have had no recollection of the time in which he was not honored with the name and ensigns of royalty, sank into a private station.

Henry submits.

Beginning of November.

But in that intolerable condition he could not re-

main ; he must determine on his future course. Whatever might be the end, it was better to confront the inexorable Pope ; to undergo, if it must be undergone, the deep humiliation of submission in Italy, rather than in the Diet of the Empire, in the face, amid the scorn and triumph, of his revolted subjects. He resolved to anticipate the journey of the Pope to Germany. Udo of Treves, his adversary, consented to be his messenger to solicit the Pope's permission to make his act of submission in Rome rather than at Augsburg. Udo's journey was stopped at Piacenza ; the enemies of Henry had anticipated his message to the Pope. Hildebrand declared his intention to hold the court at Augsburg ; however difficult and inconvenient the journey, before the 8th of January he should be at Mantua.

Nature seemed to conspire with the Pope and with his enemies against the fallen King. So hard a winter had not been known for years ; from Martinmas to the middle of April the Rhine was frozen, so as to be passable on foot. The Dukes of Bavaria and Carinthia, the enemies of Henry, commanded and jealously ^{A few days before Christmas.} watched the passes of the Alps. With difficulty Henry collected from still diminishing partisans sufficient money to defray the expenses of his journey. With his wife and infant son, and one faithful attendant, he left Spire, and turned aside into Burgundy, in hopes of finding hospitality and aid. He reached Besançon before Christmas day. William of Burgundy entertained him with courtesy.¹ He passed Christmas in Besançon with something approaching to royal state. From Besançon he made his way to Geneva, and crossed the Rhone, to the foot of Mont Cenis. There he was

¹ Satis magnifice pro sua calamitate susceptus et habitus.

met by his mother-in-law, Adelaide, the powerful Marchioness of Susa, and her son Amadeus. They received him with an outward show of honor ; but, taking advantage of his extreme necessity, they demanded the cession of five rich bishoprics as the price of his free passage through their territories. This demand might seem an insidious endeavor to commit him still further with the Pope, by forcing him to exercise or to transfer, in a simoniacal manner, the contested power of investiture. Henry was glad to extricate himself by the sacrifice of a rich district which he possessed in Burgundy.

But the Alps were still between him and Italy. The passage of Mont Cenis, notwithstanding the hardier habits of the time, was always a work of peril and difficulty ; the unusual severity of the winter made it almost desperate. Vast quantities of snow had fallen ; the slippery surface, where it had hardened, was not strong enough to bear ; the ascent seemed impracticable. But the fatal day was hastening on ; the King must reach Italy or forfeit his crown forever. At a large cost they hired some of the mountaineers well acquainted with the paths, to go before and cut something like a road through the snow for the King and his few followers. So they reached with great labor the summit of the pass. The descent seemed impossible ; it looked like a vast precipice, smooth, and almost sheer. But the danger must be overcome ; some crept down on their hands and knees ; some clung to the shoulders of the guides, and so sliding and at times rolling down the steeper declivities, reached at length the bottom without serious accident. The queen and her infant son were drawn down in the skins of oxen, as in sledges. Some of the horses were lowered

Henry passes
the Alps.

by various contrivances — some with their feet tied allowed to roll from ledge to ledge. Many were killed, many maimed ; few reached the plain in a serviceable state.

No sooner was the King's unexpected arrival made known in Italy, than the princes and the bishops assembled in great numbers, and received him with the highest honors ; in a few days he found himself at the head of a formidable army. The great cause of his popularity with so many of the Lombard nobility and the prelates, was the notion that he had crossed the Alps to depose the Pope. All, and they were neither few nor without power, who were excommunicated by Hildebrand, looked eagerly for vengeance. But Henry could not pause to plunge into this new warfare, where even in Lombardy he would have encountered half the magnates and people. He could not imperil the throne of Germany. He must obtain the absolution from his excommunicator before the fatal 25th of February.

The Pope meantime, accompanied by his powerful protectress, Matilda of Tuscany, and by the Bishop of Vercelli, had crossed the Apennines on his way to Mantua. The news of Henry's descent into Italy arrested his march. Uncertain whether he came as a humble suppliant or at the head of an army (Gregory well knew the state of Lombardy), he immediately turned aside, and took up his abode in Canosa, a strong fortress belonging to Matilda.

To Canosa first came in trembling haste many of the nobles and prelates who had been included under the ban of excommunication, and whom Henry had been forced to dismiss from his service. Most of them had been so fortunate as to elude the guards set to watch

the passes of the Alps. Dietrich, Bishop of Verdun, one of the most faithful and irreproachable of Henry's partisans (he had not concurred in his more violent proceedings), had been seized by Adelbert, Count of Calw, plundered, imprisoned, forced to promise a large ransom, and not to revenge this cruel outrage. Rupert of Bamberg, still more odious to the adverse party, was taken by Guelf, Duke of Bavaria, stripped of all his treasures, even to his pontifical robes, and kept in close captivity; neither his own entreaties nor those of his friends could obtain his liberation. With naked feet, and in the garb of penitents, the rest appeared before the Pope. To them Gregory tempered his severity by mildness. He would not refuse absolution to those who confessed and lamented their sins; but they must be purified as by fire, lest by too great facility of pardon, the atrocious and violent crime of which they had been guilty to the apostolic see, should be regarded as a light sin, or as no sin at all. The bishops were shut up in separate and solitary cells, with but a scanty supply of food till the evening. The penance of the laity was apportioned with regard to their age and strength. After this ordeal of some days, they were called before the Pope, and received absolution, with a mild rebuke, and repeated injunctions to hold no communion with their master till he should be reconciled to the Holy See.

The lenity of the Pope to his adherents may have decided the wavering mind of Henry; it may have been designed to heighten by contrast the haughty and inexorable proceedings towards the King. Hildebrand would be content with the moderate chastisement of the inferiors, from the King he would exact the most degrading humiliation. Henry first obtained an inter-

view with Matilda of Tuscany. He sent her to the Pope, loaded with prayers and promises. She was accompanied by Adelaide of Susa, the Marquis Azzo, and Hugh, the Abbot of Clugny,¹ who was supposed to possess great influence over the mind of Gregory. He entreated the Pope not too rashly to credit the jealous and hostile charges of the German princes, but to absolve the King at once from his excommunication. The Pope coldly replied, that it was inconsistent with the ecclesiastical laws to pass judgment, except in the presence of the accusers; "let him appear on the appointed day at Augsburg, and he shall receive rigid and impartial justice." The ambassadors of Henry urged that the King by no means declined, he humbly submitted to the judgment of the Pope, but in the mean time earnestly desired to be released from the excommunication. The possession of his crown depended on his immediate absolution; he would undergo any penance, and be prepared to answer hereafter before the Pope to any charges advanced against him. The implacable Pope would yield no step of his vantage ground. He might indeed dread the versatility of Henry's character, and his ready assent to the advice of flattering and desperate counsellors. "If he be truly penitent, let him place his crown and all the ensigns of royalty in my hands, and openly confess himself unworthy of the royal name and dignity." This demand seemed too harsh even to the ardent admirers of the Pope; they entreated him to mitigate the rigor of the sentence, "not to break the bruised reed." The Pope gave a vague assent to their representations.²

¹ Hugh of Clugny had been the godfather of Henry. — *Dach. Spic.* iii. p. 441.

² It is fortunate that this scene, the most remarkable in the history of

On a dreary winter morning, with the ground deep in snow, the King, the heir of a long line of emperors, was permitted to enter within the two outer of the three walls which girded the castle of Canosa. He had laid aside every mark of royalty or of distinguished station ; he was clad only in the thin white linen dress of the penitent, and there, fasting, he awaited in humble patience the pleasure of the Pope. But the gates did not uncloze. A second day he stood, cold, hungry, and mocked by vain hope. And yet a third day dragged on from morning to evening over the unsheltered head of the discrowned King. Every heart was moved except that of the representative of Jesus Christ. Even in the presence of Gregory there were low deep murmurs against his unapostolic pride and inhumanity.¹ The patience of Henry could endure no more ; he took refuge in an adjacent chapel of St. Nicolas, to implore, and with tears, once again, the intercession of the aged Abbot of Clugny. Matilda was present ; her womanly heart was melted ; she joined with Henry in his supplications to the Abbot. "Thou alone canst accomplish this," said the Abbot to the Countess. Henry fell on his knees, and in a passion of grief entreated her merciful interference. To female entreaties and influence Gregory at length yielded an ungracious permission for the King to approach his presence. With bare feet, still in the garb of penitence, stood the King, a man of singularly tall and noble person, with a countenance

the middle ages, is related by that one of the monkish annalists who aspires to the character of a historian — Lambert of Hertzfeld.

¹ Nonnulli vero in nobis non apostolicæ severitatis gravitatem, sed quasi tyrannicæ feritatis crudelitatem esse clamarunt. These are Gregory's own words in his public account of the affair. — *Ad Germanos. Regest. iv. 12.*

accustomed to flash command and terror upon his adversaries, before the Pope, a grey-haired man bowed with years, of small unimposing stature.

The terms exacted from Henry, who was far too deeply humiliated to dispute any thing, had no redeeming touch of gentleness or compassion. He was to appear in the place, and at the time which the Pope should name, to answer the charges of his subjects before the Pope himself, if it should please him to preside in person at the trial. If he should repel these charges, he was to receive his kingdom back from the hands of the Pope. If found guilty, he was peaceably to resign his kingdom, and pledge himself never to attempt to seek revenge for his deposition. Till that time he was to assume none of the ensigns of royalty, perform no public act, appropriate no part of the royal revenue which was not necessary for the maintenance of himself and of his attendants; all his subjects were to be held released from their oath of allegiance; he was to banish forever from his court Rupert, Bishop of Bamberg, and Ulric, Count of Cosheim, with Terms of submission. his other evil advisers; if he should recover his kingdom, he must rule henceforward according to the counsel of the Pope, and correct whatever was contrary to the ecclesiastical laws. On these conditions the Pope condescended to grant absolution, with the further provision that in case of any prevarication on the part of the King on any of these articles, the absolution was null and void, and in that case the princes of the empire were released from all their oaths, and might immediately proceed to the election of another king.

The oath of Henry was demanded to these conditions, to his appearance before the tribunal of the Pope, and

to the safe conduct of the Pope, if he should be pleased to cross the Alps. But the King's oath was not deemed sufficient; who would be his compurgators? The Abbot of Clugny declined, as taking such oath was inconsistent with his monastic vows. At length the Archbishop of Bremen, the Bishops of Vercelli, Osnaburg, and Zeits, the Marquis Azzo, and others of the princes present, ventured to swear on the holy reliques to the King's faithful fulfilment of all these hard conditions.

But even yet the unforgiving Hildebrand had not forced the King to drink the dregs of humiliation. He had degraded Henry before men, he would degrade him in the presence of God; he had exalted himself to the summit of earthly power, he would appeal to Heaven to ratify and to sanction this assumption of unapproachable superiority.

After the absolution had been granted in due form, the Pope proceeded to celebrate the awful
The Sacrament at Canosa. mystery of the Eucharist. He called the King towards the altar, he lifted in his hands the consecrated host, the body of the Lord, and spoke these words: — "I have been accused by thee and by thy partisans of having usurped the Apostolic See by simoniacal practices, — of having been guilty, both before and after my elevation to the Episcopate, of crimes which would disqualify me for my sacred office. I might justify myself by proof, and by the witness of those who have known me from my youth, whose suffrages have raised me to the Apostolic See. But to remove every shadow of suspicion, I appeal from human testimony to divine. Behold the Lord's body; be this the test of my innocence. May God acquit me

by his judgment this day of the crimes with which I am charged ; if guilty, strike me dead at once." He then took and ate the consecrated wafer. A pause ensued ; he stood unscathed in calm assurance. A sudden burst of admiration thrilled the whole congregation. When silence was restored, he addressed the King, "Do thou, my son, as I have done ! The Princes of the German Empire have accused thee of crimes heinous and capital ; such as in justice should exclude thee not only from the administration of public affairs, but from the communion of the Church, and all intercourse with the faithful to thy dying day. They eagerly demand a solemn trial. But human decisions are liable to error ; falsehood, dressed out in eloquence, enslaves the judgment ; truth, without this artificial aid, meets with contempt. As thou hast implored my protection, act according to my counsel. If thou art conscious of thy innocence, and assured that the accusations against thee are false, by this short course free the Church of God from scandal, thyself from long and doubtful trial. Take thou too the body of the Lord, and if God avouches thy innocence, thou stoppest forever the mouths of thy accusers. I shall become at once the advocate of thy cause, the asserter of thy guiltlessness, thy nobles will be reconciled to thee, thy kingdom restored, the fierce tumult of civil war which destroys thy empire be allayed forever." ¹

Was this a sudden impulse or a premeditated plan of Gregory ? Was it but a blind determination to push

¹ Waltram either knows nothing of this part of the scene or passes it over. *Ad comprobandum ecclesiasticæ reconciliationis testimonium, sacram communionem corporis et sanguinis Domini de manu ejus accepit. — De Unit. Eccles. ii. 15.* But he attributes this almost diabolical speech to Gregory, as addressed to Henry's enemies, *ne solliciti sitis, quoniam culpabiliorem eum reddo vobis.*

his triumph to the utmost ; or was it sincere confidence in the justice and certainty of this extraordinary ordeal ? Had he fully contemplated the dreadful alternative which he offered to the King — either boldly to deny the truth, to the smallest point, of charges not like those against himself, clear and specific, but vague, undefined, including his whole life ? In that case, did he not discern the incredible wickedness of thus tempting the King, in his stupor and confusion, to reckless perjury ? Or should the King, so adjured, prostrate himself at the feet of the Pope, and by acknowledging his guilt, deprive himself at once and forever of his crown ? Or did he suppose that God would indeed interpose, and as tradition reported of Lothair of Lorraine who had been put to the same test by Hadrian II. and met with a speedy and miserable death, so would the perjured Henry, by a still more striking example, rivet forever the bonds of ecclesiastical power upon the hearts of kings ?

Henry, in his amazement, hesitated, and stood in visible agitation. He then retired to a short distance to consult with his few followers how he should escape this terrible “ judgment of God.” He then summoned his courage, and declared that he must first obtain the opinion of those princes who had adhered to his cause ; that though this trial might be satisfactory to the few present, it would not have any effect on the obstinate incredulity of his absent enemies : he adjured the Pope to reserve the whole question for a General Council, in whose equitable decision he would acquiesce. The Pope hardly consented to this request ; but as if conscious that he had himself gone too far, he now condescended to receive the King at a banquet, treated him with courtesy, and gave him much grave advice.

Gregory had sent, in the mean time, Eppo, Bishop of Zeitz, to announce to the Italian nobles, the absolution of the King. But the Lombards had come not to see the King, but the Pope humbled. When they heard the history of Henry's debasement, they broke out into furious indignation, glared on the Bishop with fierce and menacing looks, and loaded him with insulting and contumelious language. They openly avowed their contempt for the Pope's excommunication, denied his right to the Papacy, renewed all the opprobrious accusations of adultery and other capital offences against the Pontiff. Of the King they spoke with contemptuous bitterness; he had dishonored the royal dignity by his submission to a man, a heretic and loaded with infamy; they had followed him as the avenger of their wrongs, as the asserter of justice and of ecclesiastical law; he had deserted them in the hour of trial, and made his own peace by a base and cowardly reconciliation. Their angry discontent spread through the camp. There was a general cry that the King should be compelled to abdicate the throne of which he was so unworthy, and that his son Conrad should be instantly proclaimed. With him at their head they would march to Rome, elect another Pope, who should crown the infant Emperor, and annul all the acts of this apostate Pontiff.

Henry sunk at heart, and perhaps now imagining that he had underrated his own power, did not dare to confront the tumult. He sent out some of the nobles around him to assuage the dissatisfaction, to explain the stern necessity to which he had bowed, and to assure them that hereafter he would apply all his thoughts to the assertion of their rights. The tumult was stilled;

but many of the more powerful Lombards retired in disgust to their strongholds. The rest received him as he came forth from the fatal Canosa with cold and Jan. 28. averted looks: no one approached him, but they stood apart in small knots, discussing, in hardly suppressed murmurs, his weakness and his disgrace. He retired in shame and sorrow to Reggio.

The triumph of sacerdotal Christianity, in the humiliation of the temporal power, was complete, but it was premature. Hildebrand, like other conquerors, must leave the fruits of his victory to later times. He had established in the face of Europe the great principle, the Papal power of judging Kings. Henry himself seemed at first stunned by the suddenness, the force of the blow; Christendom had in like manner been taken by surprise. But the pause of awe and reverence was but brief and transitory; a strong recoil was inevitable; the elements of resistance were powerful, and widely spread. The common hatred of Hildebrand brought together again all who, from lower or from loftier motives, abhorred his tyranny; the Germans, who resented the debasement of the Empire; the Italians, who dreaded the ascendancy of the house of Tuscany; the clergy, who, more or less conscientiously, were averse to the monastic rigor of Hildebrand — those who had felt or who dreaded his censures.

CHAPTER III.

CONTINUED STRIFE WITH KING HENRY. BERENGAR OF
TOURS. DEATH OF GREGORY.

AROUND the fallen King in Reggio assembled almost all the distinguished prelates and laity who had formed his small court at Oppenheim. ^{Henry in Reggio.} They were released from their excommunication, and prepared, with greater prudence, perhaps, but with unmitigated hostility, to resume the contest. Licmar Archbishop of Bremen, the Bishops of Zeitz, Osnaburg, Lausanne, and Basle, Ulric of Cosheim, Eberhard of Nellenburg, and Berthold, the proscribed counsellors of the King; above all, Guibert of Ravenna, whose ambition aspired to the seat of Hildebrand, with many other Italian bishops.

The two parties remained for a time watching, it might seem, each other's movements; neither could trust the other. Henry, still wearing the outward show of submission, advanced from Reggio to Ravenna. There he sent a message to the Pope, requesting that the General Council might be held in Mantua rather than in Augsburg. To this Gregory, dreading, perhaps, the passage of the Alps, and uncertain or unwilling to commit himself too far with the German adversaries of the King, now he had withdrawn the excommunication, gave an ambiguous assent. Henry, after an interview

with his mother at Piacenza, where he was said to have held secret and nightly conferences with the enemies of Gregory, approached Mantua.¹ But either secret intelligence, or not unnatural suspicion that Henry had laid a deep plot to surprise the person of the Pope in that city, alarmed the partisans of Gregory.

A.D. 1077.
March 1.

Matilda hurried the Pope back, through by-roads, to the Apennines; and again entrenched him in her impregnable fortress at Canosa. Henry, during this time, was making a progress through the cities of Lombardy. Everywhere he encountered the same sullen and contemptuous indignation. There were no deputations of the magistrates — no processions of the people to meet him; the gates were closed; he was left to lodge in the suburbs. Provisions were doled out just sufficient for his maintenance, but altogether unbecoming his royal station; guards were posted to watch his followers, lest they should dare to maraud in the neighboring villages. Henry beheld all this not without some satisfaction; if it showed aversion and contempt for him, it showed still more profound hatred of the Pope. From Monza he sent to demand permission for his coronation as King of Italy by certain other bishops, the Archbishop of Milan and the bishop of Pavia being still under the Papal interdict. Gregory eluded this request, which might have the appearance of a public acknowledgment of Henry's still unquestioned, uncontested title to his crown.

End of
February.

Slowly, as he felt his growing strength, Henry began

¹ According to Berthold Henry was to have been visited at Pavia by the famous Cencius, who surprised Gregory in Rome. The king refused him the kiss as being excommunicate! Cencius died the day they were to have met, *morte damnandus æternâ*. In puncto descendit ad inferna, adds Berthold, sub ann. 1077.

to throw off the ill-worn mask of submission. He inveighed publicly against the harshness — Henry grows in power. the tyranny of the Pope. He openly reinstated his old counsellors, especially the obnoxious Ulric of Co-sheim ; he was in more and more open communication with the declared foes of the Pope ; still there was no outward breach to justify Hildebrand in renewing the excommunication—in declaring the solemn and hard-wrung absolution null and void ; and Henry was now too strong to be safely driven to despair. He was in Italy amid potentates ready to hazard every thing in their own cause—not in his : not in Germany with almost the whole empire in rebellion.

The revolted German Princes had gone too far to retreat. The few who aspired to the throne—the many who dreaded the vengeance of Henry—the Dukes of Swabia, Bavaria, and Carinthia, with some of the Saxon chiefs ; Siegfried of Mentz, who was now too deeply committed, the Hildebrandine Bishops of Wurtzburg and Metz—had no course but to advance boldly to the deposition of the King. Beginning of February. They had met at Ulm, but the unusual cold of the season compelled them to disperse. The snow had prevented the arrival of many. They appointed the decisive Diet on the 13th of March at Forcheim.

For Gregory the position of affairs had become embarrassing to the utmost. By his severity, Embarrassment of the Pope. not merely had he not conciliated, he had degraded too deeply for reconciliation—debased, trampled upon the King. Christian forgiveness might seem to be too high a virtue to be expected from any man after such an example of implacability, least of all from a king like Henry. But yet he had released him from

the ban of excommunication. Before the appointed day of trial Henry stood absolved; the fact was public and notorious, the conditions hardly known or forgotten. The magician had dissolved his own spell. The strong ground on which the adversaries of Henry stood crumbled beneath them; they had lost the great excuse which justified them in the eyes of men for their revolt, for the deposition of Henry, for the election of a new King. Gregory conducted himself with that subtle policy in which he was as great a master as in bold resolve. He left free course to the fears and passions of the Germans hostile to Henry, yet took no step which would prevent him from disclaiming, in the face of the world, the election of Rudolph, now put openly forward as the intended successor of the deposed Henry.

Sept. 16, 1077. He retired to his safer sanctuary at Rome, where he resumed his state. Count Maingold, the brother of the historian Herman the Lame, had been despatched to Gregory with the account of the proceedings at Ulm, and a respectful invitation to the

March 1. Pope to attend in person at the Diet at Forcheim. The Pope sent a message to the confederate Princes, advising them to delay (if it could be done without danger, of which he would not take the responsibility) their final decision concerning the throne. At the same time he sent Count Maingold to Henry, to demand a safe-conduct for himself across the

About March 7. Alps. This was to be the test of Henry's fidelity. At the same time with the embassy of the Pope, Henry had received a summons to Forcheim, and also an insidious admonition from his rival Rudolph, not to enter into Germany until his mother or the Pope should have prepared the way for his reception.

Henry met subtlety with subtlety. He excused himself from appearing at Forcheim on the appointed day. "He had newly taken upon himself the functions of King of Italy; he was overwhelmed with business. The Italians would be offended at his sudden departure before he had settled their affairs." To Gregory he replied that it was beyond his ability to pledge himself for the security of the Pope; he was himself in the power of the Lombards, of whose profound hatred Gregory was aware. These ungovernable men might not respect his safe-conduct, and he might but be betraying the Pope into personal danger. Gregory did not think fit to question the truth or sincerity of these representations. He sent his two legates — the Abbot Bernhard of Marseilles, and Bernhard the Cardinal Deacon — as his representatives to the Diet.

The Diet met at Forcheim; the Papal Legates appeared. They made at first some show of Diet at Forcheim. March 13. moderation, which soon gave way before the resolute and not unexpected determination of the confederates to proceed at once to the election of a new Sovereign. The Legates mildly suggested the expediency of giving Henry another chance, and of awaiting the arrival of the Pope; but, with convenient modesty, they intimated doubts whether it could be done without danger. With the same unusual deference, they said that the possession of the throne depended not on their counsels, but on the decision of the Princes: it was for the Princes to judge what was best for the public weal:¹ but they expressed their astonishment that the German

¹ Si hoc sine periculo fieri posse perpenderent. Bernried. Cæterum provisionem regni non tam in eorum consilio, quam in principum arbitrio sitam. — Ibid.

nation should so long have endured such a King. Determined, though the Legates of the Pope thus dexterously shrunk from responsibility, to have the Pope's name on their side, the confederates declared that before, and independent of Henry's excommunication, Gregory had annulled their oaths of allegiance; themselves would be under the Apostolic censure if they should remain any longer subject to the King.

The election fell upon Rudolph of Swabia; the Papal Legates interfered to assuage some fierce jealousies which threatened to break out among the rival Princes. Among the terms to which Rudolph swore was — I., to leave the choice of the Bishops free; and II., not to endeavor to make the throne hereditary in his family. He was at once consecrated at Mentz by Archbishop Siegfried and the Archbishop of Magdeburg. The Papal Legates gave the sanction of their presence to the ceremony.

Thus was civil war proclaimed throughout Germany. A writer on the Imperial side describes its guilt and misery. For seventeen years wars and seditions raged throughout the Roman Empire. Bishop rose against Bishop;¹ the clergy against the clergy; the people against the people; father against son, son against father, brother against brother. He deliberately charges Gregory with the guilt of all this unchristian fraternal hatred — of all this unchristian bloodshed.²

¹ In a battle (Aug. 7, 1078). The Saxon battle-word was St. Peter; but the bishops on St. Peter's side ran away. Quos omnes, quia melius sciebant psalmos cantare eo quod nutriti sub religione essent, quam legiones armatas ad bella disponere, solo visu præliantium in fugam conversi sunt. Magdeburg, in his flight, was killed by the peasants; Merseburg fled naked: Siegfried of Mentz (he was retaken); Bernard, Archdeacon of Rome, Adelbert of Worms, were brought before Henry. — Bruno, c. 96.

² Waltram de Unit. Eccles. apud Freber, p. 251. See, too, the very curi-

Is posterity to allow itself to be overawed by the grandeur of Gregory's character, his inflexible adherence to what he supposed to be right, his conscientious conviction that he was maintaining the cause of God — and to dismiss this grave contemporary charge from the bar of its judgment? To take refuge in the high predestinarianism that it was the inevitable collision of two great principles — that much eventual good arose out of the maintenance of the high ecclesiastical principle — does not solve the moral difficulty. It is not sufficient to say that the good survived and the evil passed away, — that the clergy maintained a power beneficial — greatly beneficial, on the whole, to civilization — while the earth drank up the blood that was shed, and the grave closed alike over those who suffered and those who inflicted misery. Was Gregory right in the assertion of the subordination of the temporal to the spiritual power? Even if right, was civil war, with all its horrors, the legitimate means of maintaining it — legitimate to a Christian Pontiff? Was not Gregory, as the vicerent of Christ, bound to have that deep abhorrence for human misery (and of the sins as well as the misery of civil war he could not be ignorant), so as to use

ous tract of Wipo, Bishop of Ferrara, published in the last volume of Pertz, *Scriptores*, pp. 148, 179 (1856), *De Schismate Hildebrandi*. It contains a discussion between an Imperialist and a Papalist, an enemy and an advocate of Hildebrand, in which his whole conduct is argued on as by plaintiff and defendant. The author sums at the end against Hildebrand in these words: *Duo sunt quæ dampnatione dignum Ildebrandum ostendunt: quod Rodolfum in regem creari fecit, et Teutonicum bellum fieri non prohibuit, in quo sanguis octo millium hominum fusus fuit. In eo etiam perjurii reatum incurrit, quod juramenti vinculis obligatos Teutonicos sacramenti religionem violare fecit. In eo etiam scismaticus extitit, quod indignorum ministrorum et excommunicatorum sacramenta polluta docuit, non accipienda mandavit, nec sacramenta quidem dici debere perhibuit, in quibus a sanctorum patrum regulis omnino dissensit.* P. 179.

every means to avert it? Did he attempt to allay the storm, or allow his own pride and passions to embark in it? Did not his subtle policy protract wilfully — knowingly protract for his own ends — the doubtful conflict? Were the liberties of the German people, the beneficent exercise of the power of the clergy — not the power itself — the leading incentives in his thoughts? How far was the supreme Christian law sacrificed, and by him who proclaimed himself Christ's representative on earth?

The inauguration of Rudolph was in blood. No sooner had he been crowned, than a fierce tumult broke out, from an accidental cause, between the followers of some of his partisans and those of Henry. Though they succeeded in restoring quiet, the Archbishop and the new King left the Imperial city, never to return.¹

It might seem that the assumption of the throne by a rival monarch called into action all the slumbering forces of Henry's cause. Now rallied the conviction that the royal authority was, no less than that of the Pope, the ordinance of God. Loyalty, submissive conscientious loyalty, had been the boasted attribute of the primitive Christians. The watchword of the party was that St. Peter himself had connected in indissoluble union the two unrepealable truths, "Fear God," and "Honor the King." The populace of Mentz had broken out in a sudden access of fidelity to the King. Rudolph and his followers next proceeded to Worms, but Worms again cast out her tyrannous and rebel bishop, and closed her gates. Everywhere a large part of the clergy, even in Swabia, refused to break their oath of fealty.

¹ Peractâ electione simul et sanguineâ illius ordinatione. — Waltram, p. 275.

The three Hildebrandine Bishops of Wurtzburg, Metz, and Passau, alone adhered to Rudolph : some, like Otho of Constance, at once declared for Henry ; others, like Emmeric of Augsburg, only awaited a favorable time to renounce the Swabian cause.

No sooner had the news of the rival Emperor's election reached King Henry in Italy, than he sent to the Pope to demand Rudolph's excommunication as an unauthorized usurper. Gregory had recourse to his usual subterfuge — the injustice of condemnation without regular investigation of the cause.

Henry, with no longer delay than was necessary to collect some forces, which rapidly increased A.D. 1077. as he proceeded, left the care of his son Con- Henry in Germany. rad and the government of Italy to the Bish- April and May. ops of Milan and Piacenza, and crossed the Alps. He was received with ardor by his partisans. Swabia first paid the penalty for the ambition of her prince. From the Necker to the Main all was laid waste. The fierce Bohemian half-pagan allies, who had joined the standard of Henry, treated churches with no more reverence than stables ; women were violated on the altars. The war at once took its most ruthless and exterminating character.

The confederates looked in vain to Rome, which at least had not forbidden, which, it could hardly be denied, had fomented, had encouraged, had justified the rebellion.¹ Gregory now assumed the lofty tone of

¹ At the synod at Rome, March 3, 1078, Gregory anathematized the Archbishops of Ravenna and Milan, the Bishops of Cremona and Treviso, the Cardinal Hugo of St. Clement. He decreed as to the disturbances of the kingdom of Germany — *nuncii a latere apostolicæ sedis ad partes illas mittantur, qui omnes religiosos et justitiæ amantes, clericalis et laicalis ordinis viros convocent cum quibus aut finem aut pacem juste compo-*

arbiter, and commanded them to lay aside their arms,
 May 31. and await his sublime award. The Saxons
 addressed him in strong remonstrances; he had excited
 them to revolt by his excommunication of Henry; he
 had absolved them from their oaths, and now he af-
 fected to speak with equable impartiality. The heav-
 ens, they had thought, would stand still, earth move
 like the heavens, ere the throne of St. Peter would lose
 the firmness of Peter.¹ Thrice they wrote, in grief, in
 remonstrance, in indignation. Thrice must the cock
 crow to remind St. Peter of his weakness. At one
 Oct. 12, juncture, indeed, the Legate, who had made
 At Goslar. common cause with the confederates, ventured
 to renew the excommunication; he was neither avowed
 nor disclaimed by the Pope, and the interdict, therefore,
 had no great effect.

The character of Gregory cannot claim the excuse
 of irresolution. Yet for nearly two years did Hilde-
 brand, while the war raged fiercely, maintain this
 doubtful policy, holding the language of peace, but
 claiming the right, which could not but be inadmissible,
 to dictate that peace. Wherever the final Council or
 Diet of the Empire was to meet and adjudicate on the
 conflicting titles of the two sovereigns, there he was to
 be present, to preside in person, or by his legates, and
 March, 1078. pronounce his award. Total submission to
 the Roman see was the first preliminary admitted in

*nant, aut veritate percognitâ, cui parti magis justitia faveat, ad plenum
 addiscere valeant: quatenus pars injusta resipiscat et apostolicâ auctoritate
 munita justitia vigoris et auctoritatis robur obtineat. — Mansi, xx. p. 503.*
 See, however, forward for further proceedings.

¹ Bruno. They complained that he was apostolici vigoris oblitus . . .
 at nostrates . . . a magna spe. quam in apostolicâ petrâ posuerant, excide-
 runt, quia prius cœlum stare, vel terram crediderunt cœli modo moveri,
 quam cathedram Petri amittere constantiam Petri. — c. 107.

the Court of the Pope. "If either of these Kings (thus he writes to the German nation), inflated by pride, shall in any way impede our journey to you, and conscious of his unjust cause, decline the judgment of the Holy Ghost, resisting in his disobedience his Holy Mother, the Catholic Church, him despise ye as a brood of anti-Christ, a destroyer of the Christian religion, and respect any sentence which our legates may pronounce against him. To those, on the other hand, who shall humbly submit to our judgment, pay all reverence and honor." ¹

But Henry's submission to any arbitration, even if the scene at Canosa had not taught him mistrust of the Pope's equity, of the Pope's justice, had invalidated his title. That he was the actual, undeposed, undeposable King, his rival a rebel and an usurper, was the strength of his cause. Gregory's words of peace, therefore, however lofty, could not be expected even by himself to overawe the civil war, of which his own pretensions were one of the causes. His language, indeed, was appalling enough. In a second ^{Policy of Gregory.} address to the German nation, he anathematizes all who shall impede the assembling a general Diet to judge between the two kings, whether king, archbishop, duke, marquis, or of whatsoever station or dignity. Nor does he confine his denunciations to the remote spiritual state of the transgressor; he imprecates vengeance on his body as on his soul. "In all his acts may he feel (the imprecation, no doubt, was intended as a prediction) the vengeance of Almighty God; in every battle may he find his strength fail; ^{March 3, 1078.} may he never obtain a victory, but, prostrate

¹ Ad Germanos, iv. 24.

in humble contrition, be abased and confounded, till he is brought to true repentance." Such was the Papal address, sanctioned by a great synod at Rome.¹

But in the midst of this conflict with the temporal power, it might seem for the life or death of Papal, of sacerdotal Christianity, the doctrinal antagonist of that power had risen again, still pertinaciously determined to know no defeat. Berengar of Tours demands another solemn condemnation. In vain had three Councils — at Paris, at Rome, at Vercelli — issued their decrees; Berengar either treated them with scorn, or with his subtle logic attempted to prove, that while they censured they acceded to his doctrines. He had recanted all his enforced recantations, or denied that he had in truth recanted. In vain had one Pope (Leo) committed himself, committed the Papal authority, to the actual censure; in vain his successors, Victor, Nicolas, Alexander, had at least acquiesced in the repudiation of the perilous tenet. In vain had Lanfranc, now Primate of Norman England, and esteemed among the first, if not the first, theologian of Christendom, promulgated his refutation. The mere fact that at such a crisis a new council must be held at Rome, that the heresiarch dares again appear to answer for his doctrine, manifests the obstinate vitality, if not the increasing power and expanding influence of Berengar.

But the conduct of Gregory at this council, his treatment of the great heresiarch, is in the strangest contrast with that to his imperial antagonist. Hildebrand, on all questions of Church power so prompt, decisive, instantaneous in his determinations; so impatient of op-

Feb. 11,
1079.
Berengar of
Tours.

¹ Ibid. Regest. v. 15.

position, so merciless to a foe within his power ; so pertinacious to crush out the last words of submission where he feels his superiority ; so utterly, it should seem conscientiously, remorseless, when the most remote danger can be apprehended or warded off from the vast fabric of the theocracy, from the universal, all-embracing, as he hoped, eternal ecclesiastical dominion — is now another man. Compare Gregory VII. in the condemnation of Investitures and Gregory in defence of Transubstantiation : Gregory with King Henry at Canosa, and with Berengar at Tours, or at Rome. Hildebrand, it might almost seem for the first time, on this cardinal doctrine, is vacillatory, hesitating, doubtful. He will recur to the Blessed Virgin ¹ to enlighten him, and the Blessed Virgin appears to acquit Berengar of any dangerous heresy.² He even bears the clamor of the populace.³

¹ Ego planè te de Christi sacrificio secundum Scripturas bene sentire non dubito, tamen quia consuetudinis mihi est ad B. Mariam de his quæ me movent, recurrere, ante aliquot dies imposui religioso cuidam amico, jejuniis et orationibus operam dare, atque ita a B. Maria obtinere, ut per eum mihi non taceret. How strange is this ! The Pope propitiating the Virgin by another's fasts and prayers, and receiving the oracle, not directly, but through him. His religious friend heard from the Virgin — a B. Maria audivit — that Berengar's views were scriptural. This is Berengar's statement. — Acta Berengarii, Mansi, xix. p. 766.

² This vague oath of Berengar was accepted as orthodox. Profiteor panem altaris post consecrationem esse verum corpus Christi, quod natum est de Virgine, quod passum est in cruce, quod sedet ad dexteram Patris ; et vinum altaris, postquam consecratum est, esse verum sanguinem qui manavit de latere Christi. Et sicut ore pronuncio, ita me corde habere confirmo, sic me adjuvet Deus et hæc sacra. There is no word of *transubstantiation*. Luther and the Anglican Church might subscribe this ; perhaps even under the ambiguous *verum*, many other believers. Gregory not only declares that himself, but that Peter Damiani had rejected the views of Lanfranc. — Berengarii Act. Roman. Concil., Mansi, xix.

³ Berengar asserts that he lived a year with the Pope, who supposed that by this creed, and by the assertion of the authority of Damiani, he had restrained or silenced the rabble (*turba*), but his hopes were vain ; the

He lays himself open to the bitter taunts which he must well have known that his enemies would seize every opportunity to heap upon him, to protect Berengar from an unjust or too rigorous sentence. He dismisses the heresiarch, it might seem uncondemned, or even with honor. Berengar, already censured by former Popes, bears with him in triumph recommendatory letters from Gregory VII. Berengar dies in peace, in full possession of his ecclesiastical dignities.

Was it that from the first the bold, logical mind of Berengar at Tours had cast a spell upon Hildebrand? Was it a calm, stern sense of justice, which believed, and dared to assert, that Berengar's opinions had been misrepresented by his blind or malignant enemies? Was it that he was caught in the skilful web of Berengar's dialectics? Was his sagacity at fault for once; and was his keen foresight obtuse to the inevitable consequences which the finer instinctive dread of the greater part of the religious world felt to its very heart, that from the doctrine of Transubstantiation, in its hardest, most material form, once defined, once avowed, once established by the decrees of Popes and Councils, there was no retreat without shaking the sacerdotal power to its base — that bolder men would inevitably either advance on Berengar's opinions, or teach undisguised that which Berengar concealed under specious phraseology? The priest's power, as it was afterwards intrepidly stated, of making God; the miracles which

tumult began again, *et ita circa quædam per Papæ inconstantiam* (is this Hildebrand?) *quoad sperabat turba, rei exitus habuit.*

¹ *Literæ commendatitæ Gregorii VII. datæ Berengario, d'Achery Spicileg. iii. 413.* He anathematizes those who call Berengar, the son of the Roman Church, a heretic. Gieseler, ii. p. 1, p. 293–4, has quoted the passages with his usual accuracy and copiousness.

became, or had become so common, to prove, not the spiritual, but the grosser material transmutation, fell away at once: and with it how much of sacerdotal authority, sacerdotal wealth, sacerdotal dominion! — some might suppose of true and humble reverence for the mystery of the Eucharist! With the whole religion, now and for some centuries become materialism more or less refined, how perilous spiritualism in its holiest, most august rite! Gregory can hardly have supposed that by mildness, moderation, candor, he could propitiate to silence or to inactivity the busy, vain heresiarch. Be it as it may, Gregory had to bear, and he can hardly but have foreseen that he should have to bear, the reproach that he himself doubted the real presence of the body and blood of the Redeemer in the Sacrament — that he was an infidel.¹

In the same year with the council which arraigned Berengar, Gregory was reduced, by the increasing successes of Henry, to disavow his legates: the war went on, unheeding his commands, his rebukes, his menaces; even his thunders were drowned in the din of arms; fiercer passions had quelled for a time even religious fears.

It was not till the unwearied activity, enterprise, courage, and craft of Henry had given him great hopes of final triumph,² and the cause of Rudolph, from the divisions which Henry had artfully sowed among his formidable partisans the Saxons, seemed desperate, that

¹ En verus pontifex et verus sacerdos qui dubitat, si illud quod sumitur in dominicâ mensâ, sit verum corpus et sanguis Christi. So writes Egilbert, Archbishop of Treves. — In Eccard. C. H. Medii Ævi, ii. 170. Jejunium indixit cardinalibus, ut Deus ostenderet, quis rectius sentiret de corpore Domini, Romanave ecclesia an Berengarius — dubius in fide, infidelis est. — Benno. in Goldast, p. 3.

² Bonizo owns Henry to have been magni consilii et mirabiliter sagax.

Gregory abandoned his temporizing policy. Up to this time his ambition might still hope that he might be recognized by the two weary and exhausted parties as the irrefragable arbiter, in the Diet of Germany, of their quarrels ; and his prerogative of adjudicating the crown might be admitted in the face of Christendom by the consentient Teutonic nation.

But the low state of Rudolph's affairs compelled him now to a more decided course. To surrender Rudolph was to surrender himself. If he allowed Rudolph to be utterly crushed, the conqueror of Germany, the head of Northern Italy, with an army flushed with victory, and inured to contempt of things sacred, might descend, irresistible as Charlemagne or Otho, but with far other designs, on Rome ; scatter the Tuscans — win, perhaps, the Normans by a share of the plunder — the Normans whom Gregory now held in excommunication, and now in close alliance. A decision in favor of Henry would only increase his strength without in the least slaking his inveterate, treasured, long-provoked vengeance. Hildebrand's old resolution returned. He determined again to wield that weapon which had before served him with such tremendous force : he might almost seem to have reserved the last resource of excommunication for such a perilous crisis.

At Rome, with no solemn trial, on the earnest supplication of Rudolph's ambassadors, notwithstanding the hardy protests from those of Henry, the Archbishop of Bremen and the Bishop of Bamberg, the Pope proceeded again to this terrific sentence ; again he pronounced against King Henry the decree of excommunication — of deposition.

A. D. 1080.
March 7.
Henry again
excommunicated.

The Council commenced its proceedings with a

strong prohibition against lay investiture, against the acceptance of it by the clergy, the grant by the laity. It then went on to the excommunication of Tedaldo claiming to be Archbishop of Milan, against Guibert of Ravenna, and Roland Bishop of Treviso. The anathema against King Henry was worded with great care and solemnity. It began with prayer to St. Peter and St. Paul. It repeated the usual declaration of Gregory as to the reluctance with which he had entered into public affairs, and the compulsion which had forced him into the Papacy. It recited the former excommunication, the submission of Henry; declared that the Pope had taken no part in the election of Rudolph, but that Rudolph, thus freely elected, had professed unlimited obedience to the Roman See; that Henry likewise had implored his support against Rudolph; that he had consented to hold a council to decide on their conflicting claims, and anathematized all who should impede the meeting of that Council. The guilt of impeding the Council, and all the crimes and miseries of the civil war, are charged against Henry alone. "Wherefore, trusting in the justice and mercy of God, and of his blessed Mother, the ever-blessed Virgin Mary, on your authority (that of St. Peter and St. Paul), the above named Henry and all his adherents I excommunicate and bind in the fetters of anathema; on the part of God Almighty, and on yours, I interdict him from the government of all Germany and of Italy. I deprive him of all royal power and dignity. I prohibit every Christian from rendering him obedience as king. I absolve all who have sworn or shall swear allegiance to his sovereignty from their oaths.¹ In every battle may Henry

¹ Bernried shows the manner in which the papal power of deposing

and his partisans be without strength, and gain no victory during his life. And that Rudolph whom the Germans have elected for their king, may he rule and defend that realm in fidelity to you! On your part, I give and grant to those who shall faithfully adhere to the said Rudolph full absolution of all their sins, and in entire confidence blessing in this life and in the life to come. As Henry, for his pride, disobedience, and falsehood, is justly deposed from his royal dignity, so that royal power and dignity is granted to Rudolph, for his humility, obedience, and truth." The censure did not conclude without the personal sentence upon Henry. It proceeded to the broad, bold assertion of more than the absolute supremacy of the ecclesiastical over the civil power; it declared all possessions, all dignities, all powers, to be at the sole disposition of the Church. "Come, then, ye fathers and most holy prelates, let all the world understand and know, that since ye have power to bind and loose in heaven, ye have power to take away and to grant empires, kingdoms, principalities, duchies, marquisates, counties, and the possessions of all men according to their deserts. Ye have often deprived wicked and unworthy men of patriarchates, primacies, archbishoprics, bishoprics, and bestowed them on religious men. If ye then judge in spiritual affairs, how great must be your power in secular! and if ye are to judge angels, who rule over proud princes, what may ye not

kings was interpreted by his adherents. In all his extreme acts of power Gregory was under the direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost. *Nemo autem Romanorum Pontificum Reges a regno deponere posse denegabit, quicunque decreta sanctissimi Papæ Gregorii non proscribenda judicabit. Ipse enim vir apostolicus, cui Spiritus Sanctus in aurem decernenda dictavit, in apostolicâ sede constitutus, irrefragabiliter decrevit reges a suis dignitatibus cedere, et participatione Dominici corporis et sanguinis carere, si præsumerent jussa apostolicæ sedis contemnere.* — Vit. Gregor. vii. c. xevii.

do to these their servants ? Let kings, then, and all the princes of the world learn what ye are, and how great is your power, and fear to treat with disrespect the mandates of the Church ; and do ye on the aforesaid Henry fulfil your judgment so speedily that he may know that it is through your power, not by chance, that he hath fallen — that he be brought to repentance by his ruin, that his soul may be saved in the day of the Lord.”

Not content with this tremendous excommunication, Gregory ventured to assume the prophetic office. He declared publicly, and either believed himself, or wished others to believe, with the authority of divine revelation, that unless Henry made his submission before the Festival of St. Peter and St. Paul, the 29th of June, he would be deposed or dead ; and if his vaticination failed, men were to cease to believe in the authority of Gregory.

War was thus declared. Gregory, it is said, sent a crown to Rudolph, with an inscription that it was the gift of St. Peter.¹ Henry and the Bishops of his party heard not now with cowering fear, with disordered minds, and distracted counsels, but with the strongest indignation — with the most resolute determination to run all hazards — the anathema of the Pope. It seemed to have lost all its terrors even on the popular mind : no defections took place : no desertions from the court, the council, or the army. All disclaimed at once further allegiance to Gregory. Henry, in a letter to Dietrich Bishop of Verdun, issued his commands that the princes and prelates of the em-

The Pope
acknowledges
Rudolph
King.

¹ Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rudolfo.

pire should be summoned to Mentz on the 31st of May, April 12. to depose the Pope, and to elect a new Head of the Church. At Mentz nineteen Bishops met, and with one voice determined to renounce Hildebrand as Pope. To this decree it was important to obtain the assent of the Lombard prelates. The Bishop of Spire crossed the Alps; the Archbishops of Milan and Ravenna assembled their suffragans at Brixen in the Tyrol.

June 25.
Gregory
deposed.

There, in a synod of thirty bishops, they confirmed the deposition of the false monk Hildebrand called Gregory VII.¹ To the charges of licentiousness, bribery, and disturbance of the peace of the empire, they added accusations of heresy and necromancy. "We assembled by the authority of God in this place, having read the letter from the synod of nineteen bishops held at Mentz against the licentious Hildebrand, the preacher of sacrilegious and incendiary doctrines; the defender of perjury and murder; who, as an old disciple of the heretic Berengar, has endangered the Catholic and Apostolic doctrine of the Body and Blood of Christ;² the worshipper of divinations and of dreams; the notorious necromancer; himself possessed with an evil spirit, and therefore guilty of departing from the truth; him we adjudge to be canonically deposed and expelled from his see, and

¹ Quod a sæculo non est auditum, ut tot uno tempore inimicus humani generis mente captos contra sanctam Romanam ecclesiam armasset episcopos. — Bonizo, p. 815.

² This charge no doubt arose from his acceptance of the ambiguous confession from Berengar, see p. 86; and no doubt much was made of the declaration which Berengar asserted him to have made, that he had received a special message from the Virgin Mary, testifying that the doctrine of Berengar was consonant with the Scriptures. — Acta Concil. in caus. Berengar.; Martene et Durand Thesaur. Anecd. iv. p. 103.

unless, on hearing our judgment, he shall descend from his throne to be condemned for everlasting.”¹

And now Guibert of Ravenna attained the object of his ambition: he was elected Pope by the unanimous voice of the assembly. But Christendom had submitted too long to the supremacy of Hildebrand to disbelieve or to question his title to the Popedom. This proceeding would appear to the world, not as a solemn decree of the Church, but as a passion-

1	IMPERIALIST PRELATES.			PAPALISTS.		
Siegfried, Archbishop of Mentz, at first, then neutral, driven by his fears to be an ardent Hildebrandine after the excommunication.						
Udo	“	“	Treves, first Papalist, afterwards an Imperialist at the Elster.			
Hildorf	“	“	Cologne.	Wezelin, Archbishop of Magdeburg, killed 1078.	Saxon Insurgents.	
Licmar	“	“	Bremen.	Gebhard “ “ Salzburg.		
Rupert, Bishop of Bamberg.				Burchard, Bishop of Halberstadt.		
William	“	“	Utrecht.	Wezel “ “ Hildesheim.		
Eppo	“	“	Zeitz.	Adalbero “ “ Wurtzburg.		
Otho	“	“	Constance.	Herman “ “ Metz.		
Burchard	“	“	Lausanne.	Altman “ “ Passau.		
Burchard	“	“	Basil.	Adalbert “ “ Worms.		
Henry	“	“	Spires.	Werner “ “ Merseburg.		
Werner	“	“	Strasburg.			
Emmeric	“	“	Augsburg.			
Poppo	“	“	Toul.			
Dietrich	“	“	Verdun.	Hugh, Bishop of Lyons.		
Benzo	“	“	Osnaburg.			

*Italians.**Italians*

Guibert, Archbishop of Ravenna.			Anselm, Bishop of Lucca.		
Tedaldo	“	“	Milan.	Gregory	“ “ Vercelli.
William, Bishop of Pavia.				Otto	“ “ Ostia.
Arnulf	“	“	Cremona.	Reginald	“ “ Como.
Alexander	“	“	Piacenza.		
“	“	“	Spoletto.		
Grisforano	“	“	Fermo.		
Roland	“	“	Treviso.		
Cunibert	“	“	Turin.		
Siegfried	“	“	Bologna.		
Heribert	“	“	Modena.		
Elimpert	“	“	Arezzo.	Desiderius, Abbot of Monte Casino.	

ate act of revenge, inflaming both the King and the prelates to overstep their powers. It neither shook the faith of his partisans, nor strengthened in their animosity the enemies of Hildebrand. Guibert was probably more dangerous as Archbishop of Ravenna and Chancellor of Italy than as the Anti-pope Clement III.

The horrors of civil war might appear to be drawing to a close in Germany. The two armies met for a decisive battle near the Elster. It might seem a religious no less than a civil war. Henry was accompanied to the battle by the Archbishops of Cologne and Treves and fourteen other prelates. The Saxons advanced to the charge, with the bishops of their party and the clergy chanting the eighty-second psalm, "God standeth in the congregation of the princes." At the first gleam of success, the army of Henry broke out into the "Te Deum laudamus," and when, after the great reverse in the battle, their camp at Erfurt Oct. 13.

was surprised, they were singing a triumphant Kyrie Eleison. The defeat of Henry was more than counter-balanced by the fall of his rival. Rudolph, notwithstanding that he was the champion of the Pope, the subject of his triumphant vaticination, was mortally wounded in the battle. Some misgivings as to the justice of his cause embittered his last moments. His hand had been struck off by a sabre: as he gazed on it, he said, "With this hand I ratified my oath of fealty to my sovereign Henry; I have now lost life and kingdom. Bethink ye, ye who have led me on, in obedience to whose counsels I have ascended the throne, whether ye have guided me right."

The death of Rudolph, though it did not restore peace to Germany — though the fatal strife was yet to

last many years — paralyzed the adversaries of Henry for a time, and gave him leisure to turn his forces against his more irreconcilable enemy.

In the spring of the year 1081 Henry crossed the Alps in far different condition from that in which four years before he had stolen, a de-^{Henry in Italy.}serted and broken-spirited suppliant, to the feet of the Pope. Gregory had been shown in the face of the world a false prophet : Heaven had ratified neither his anathema nor his predictions. Instead of his defeat and death, Henry came in the pride of conquest ; and it was his adversary who had fallen, as his friends declared, by the manifest judgment of God, in the battle-field by the Elster. There was now no reluctance to follow him in a war which before seemed sacrilegious and impious ; no desertion from his ranks — no defection from his councils.¹ All Lombardy was zealous in his cause : on the same day that the battle was fought on the Elster the troops of his partisans had defeated those of the Countess Matilda ; the allegiance of her subjects was shaken.

The only protectors to whom Gregory could now look were the Normans ; but even the Normans, on account of some border disputes about territories, which they refused to abandon at the word of the Pope, were under the ban of excommunication. With them, however, he made a hasty treaty, withdrawing ^{May, 1081.} the interdict on the first seeming concession, and condescended to leave in abeyance the contested claims to Fermo. But the Normans, instead of marching, as Gregory proposed, with the Pope at their head, against

¹ All the Italians, Gregory himself repeatedly says, were for Henry. — Regest. ix. 3.

July, 1081. Ravenna,¹ had embarked on a wild enterprise against the Greek empire, and were besieging Durazzo on the other side of the Adriatic.

Still Gregory was as firm in danger and adversity, as he had been imperious and disdainful in the height of his power. The very depth of his soul was filled with confidence in the justice of his cause, and the certainty of divine favor. The way to Rome lay open to the army of Henry; the Countess Matilda could not venture on resistance in the field; she retired for security to her fortresses in the Apennines. By Pentecost the Germans and Lombards might be at the gates of Rome, the Germans infuriated by the hard measure dealt to their master; the Lombards by religious as well as by civil animosity. But the inflexible Gregory refused all concession; he indignantly rejected the advice, the supplications of his adherents, at least to make a show of submission. Even at the time when the vengeance of Henry was rapidly advancing against his undefended foe, he renewed his most imperious proclamations; he wrote to the leader of his partisans in language even for him unprecedently bold and contemptuous. The secular power is no longer admitted, as with the sacerdotal, a coincident appointment of God. It has its origin in human wickedness and diabolic suggestion; in blind ambition and intolerable presumption; kingship is an audacious usurpation on the natural equality of man.²

¹ Epist. viii. 7.

² To Herman of Metz. Quis nesciat reges et duces ab iis habuisse principium, qui Deum ignorantes superbiâ, rapinis, perfidiâ, homicidiis, postremo universis pœne sceleribus, mundi principe diabolo scilicet aptante, *super pacis scilicet homines*, dominari cœcâ cupiditate et intolerabili præsumptione affectaverint. Are we reading a journalist of Paris in 1791? Every king, he proceeds, on his deathbed, as a humble and pitiful suppliant implores the

But Rome was under the absolute control of Gregory; it was not merely faithful, it was firm, united, courageous. Cencius had died in exile, and, though magnificently buried by Guibert of Ravenna, his faction seemed to have died with him. The city must have been well provisioned, the fortifications had been strengthened, and more than its outward strength, the old Roman energy and determination appears to have revived in the hearts of its defenders.¹

For three successive years Henry encamped under the walls of Rome, while the Pope within those impregnable walls, which the Germans did not venture at first even to attempt to storm, held him at defiance, and all this time the Romans, for once, maintained their fidelity. The wealth of Matilda, it is said, assisted in securing their loyalty.

Year after year, summer, by its intolerable heats, and by the sickness, which constantly spread among the German troops, relieved the Pope and his city from the presence of his enemies. In the first year the army broke up in the beginning of July; the next the siege or blockade lasted no longer than Easter. In the third Henry lay encamped against the Leonine city, on the right

Gregory
besieged in
Rome.

Three years'
siege.

July 7, 1081.
Christmas,
1081, to
Easter
(April 24)
1082.
1083.

assistance of a priest to save him from the eternal dungeon of hell. Can a king baptize? Can a king make the body and blood of Christ by a word (*quis eorum potest proprio ore corpus et sanguinem Domini conficere?*) What king has ever wrought miracles (we say not as the apostles or the martyrs), but as St. Martin, St. Antony, or St. Benedict? Could Constantine, Theodosius, Honorius, Charles, or Louis, the most Christian kings? — Ibid.

¹ Two senators of Rome, according to Benzo, had been present in the Council at Brixen, and promised to surrender Rome. They termed the Pope's supporters "prevaricatores," but they admit that Gregory had *fascinated* the Romans. — *Introduct. ad Lib. vi. p. 1044.*

bank of the Tiber, from Christmas to the beginning of June. All his attempts to storm the city or to make a practicable breach in the walls had been in vain. An accident made him master of this part of Rome. While both parties were in profound repose, two followers of the Archbishop of Milan, stole under a part of the walls which had been slightly broken. They climbed up, found the sentinels asleep, killed them, got possession of a tower, and made a signal to the royal army, which advanced rapidly to their support. The Leonine city June 9, 1083. was thus lost; but the Pope threw himself into the castle of St. Angelo, and the whole of Rome on the left bank of the Tiber still defied the enemy.¹

The Romans at length grew weary of enduring the miseries of a siege; there seemed no hope of speedy relief from the Normans. The resources of Gregory, which as yet had been amply supplied by Matilda, began to fail. The Eastern Emperor Alexius, attacked in his own dominions by Robert Guiscard, had entered into close alliance with Henry, and supplied him with large sums of money, which were unscrupulously distributed among the wavering Romans.²

At this juncture negotiations were commenced, but with profound mistrust, and undissembled conviction that Henry on his side would observe no oaths. The Pope had openly asserted his own prerogative of releasing from all oaths. Henry offered to accept the imperial crown from the hand of Hildebrand. By this proposition he recognized the right of Gregory to the papal see, and threw aside his own anti-pope,

Negotiations,
July.

¹ Bernold. *Chronicon*. sub ann.

² Cumque pecuniâ et terrore et vi omnes fere sibi acquisivisset Romanos.
— Bonizo.

Guibert of Ravenna. But under this lurked subtle policy. If he accepted these terms, Gregory annulled at once all his former acts, pronounced his own excommunication unjust, and that he who had been declared unworthy to rule as king, was now fit to receive from the hands of the Pope the imperial crown. If he rejected these overtures, which wore the appearance of moderation, on him lay all the blame of the prolonged contest; the charge of inexorably pursuing his own imperious views, even in these desperate times, at any cost of human bloodshed and misery, even at the hazard of endangering the Papacy itself.

Not less sagacious than intrepid and inflexible, Gregory maintained as lofty a tone as if Henry ^{Firmness of Gregory.} were still at his feet at Canosa. He demanded unconditional submission: "Let the King lay down his crown, and give satisfaction to the Church." The clergy and the laity — bishops, abbots, monks, entreated him to have mercy on the afflicted city. The Romans implored, clamored, murmured, menaced his unyielding obstinacy. Hildebrand despised alike supplications, murmurs, and menaces.

The Romans at length, at once assailed by bribes and fears, declared in favor of Henry. They took the management of the treaty into their own hands. The Pope was to summon a General Council for the middle of November; the Emperor to grant safe-conduct to all who might attend it. Rome, in the mean time, was to observe a kind of independent neutrality. But the Roman leaders agreed, at the same time, on a separate, perhaps a secret article, that at the appointed time, either Gregory himself, or another Pope elected ^{The Romans} for that purpose, should present Henry with ^{waver.}

the imperial crown. They gave twenty hostages for the fulfilment of this treaty.

The troops of Henry were suffering from heat and from fevers. He hastily ran up a fort on a small hill called the Palatiolus, left a garrison of one hundred knights, with Ulric of Cosheim, which commanded the Leonine city, and departed to subdue the fortresses of Gregory's faithful ally the Countess Matilda.¹ He

Henry in
Tuscany.

wasted Tuscany with fire and sword. The subjects of Matilda, even some of the strongest episcopal partisans of Hildebrand, began either openly to revolt, or to make separate terms with Henry. Adelheid, the Marchioness of Susa, attempted to negotiate a treaty between the King and the Papalist Countess. The Anti-Pope assailed her with flattering letters. But Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, counteracted all the intrigues of the royal party : he raised troops to revenge the burning of Matilda's castles by burning those of the chieftains who had revolted to the King. He bribed as boldly as he fought ; and if the womanly fears of Matilda, or her gentler feelings towards her afflicted subjects, had shaken her steadfast mind, she neither dared nor wished to shake off the commanding control of the martial Bishop.²

The Council met on the 20th of November ; but it was not a full assembly of stately prelates, but a few, and those exclusively of Hildebrand's party. Those who had already committed themselves, by acknowledging the Anti-Pope, could not obey the summons of Hildebrand, as they could hardly hope on his own

¹ Compare throughout Benzo apud Mencken. — Lib. vi.

² There is a Life, or rather a legend, of Anselm of Lucca, in Pertz, xiv. 1.

ground to overbear him by numbers. They stood aloof; and moreover, the titles of most of these would have been called in question. Henry, on his side, foreseeing the predominance of the Papal party, prevented some of Hildebrand's avowed partisans, Anselm of Lucca, Hugh of Lyons, Reginald of Como, and Otto of Ostia, from approaching Rome. Gregory displayed his highest eloquence in his address to this assembly, which sate for three days in melancholy deliberation. He spoke, it is said, with the voice of an angel, not of a man; and the groans and sobs of almost all present acknowledged his still prevailing power over their hearts and minds. Their prudence, however, restrained them from repeating, in this trying hour, the sentence of excommunication. The censure of ^{Nov. 20, 1083.} the Church was only uttered against those who had presumed to prevent the prelates from attending the council, and, as in the case of the Bishop of Ostia, to seize their persons.

But a more seasonable succor arrived: a gift of 30,000 pieces of gold (Eastern plunder) from Robert Guiscard. The mercenary Romans ^{Succors of money from the Normans.} were again faithful subjects of the Pope; and when Henry, once more under the walls, demanded the fulfilment of the treaty, they evaded their oaths both by the most insolent mockery and pitiful casuistry. They had promised that the Pope should *give the crown*, not that he should crown and anoint the King. They proposed, and the Representative of all Truth sanctioned their proposition, that if penitent, and his penitence implied his resignation of his authority into the hands of the Pope, he should receive the crown, with the Papal benediction. If not, he should still receive the

crown — it was to be let down to him upon a rod from the Castle of St. Angelo. Such was the power and holiness of oaths!

Henry renewed the siege with the resolute determination to hear no further terms from his stubborn and treacherous foe. But the city still held out. His garrison had been obliged by sickness to abandon the fort on the Palatiolus and his other works. All was to recommence anew. He made some predatory incursions into Campania, and perhaps, to watch any hostile movements of Robert Guiscard, into Apulia. But Germany imperatively required his presence; his interests there were in peril; and in despair of success

Henry master
of Rome.
Christmas,
1083.

against Rome, he was actually about to give orders for his retreat. Suddenly an embassy arrived from the Romans (the gold pieces of Guiscard were now, no doubt, exhausted, and those of Henry more lavishly distributed), offering to surrender the city. Hildebrand hastily retired into the Castle of St. Angelo; and from its walls the haughty Pope might behold the excommunicated King and his rival Pope entering in triumph through the Lateran gate. He saw the procession pass, as it were, under his feet, first to an assembly of prelates to elect the Pope. He had to endure the mockery of a summons to this hostile Council, which affected to wait three days for his appearance;¹ and then again on Palm Sunday he saw

A.D. 1084.
March 29.

them pass to the consecration of Guibert of Ravenna in the Church of St. Peter. Guibert was consecrated by the Bishops of Modena, Bologna, and Arezzo. On Easter Day, the King, with

¹ Expectatur per triduum delitescendo. — Benzo, Proleg. ad L. vii.

his wife Bertha, passed in state to the Vatican, to receive the imperial crown from the hands of Clement III. A few feeble attempts by his adherents to excite tumult, and to maintain some strongholds in the city, were suppressed by the troops of Henry. Gregory was a prisoner — a prisoner who, it might seem, must soon be compelled by despair, by famine, or by treachery, to yield himself up to the unslaked vengeance of the King.

Tidings, however, soon arrived which at once changed the aspect of affairs. Desiderius, the Abbot Approach of the Normans. April. of Monte Casino, arrived in Rome, and communicated both to the Emperor and to the Pontiff that Robert Guiscard was rapidly advancing at the head of 6,000 knights and 30,000 foot. It was a strange army of the faith : from every quarter men had rushed to his banner, some to rescue the Pope, others from love of war. The Saracens had enlisted in great numbers.

The news was as appalling to Henry as welcome to the Pope. His army was not strong enough to cope with this formidable host. He made the Romans swear fidelity to their Cæsar ; he took Early in May. forty hostages ; he destroyed part of the fortifications which had resisted his power, the Castle on the Capitoline Hill, and some of the walls of the Leonine city. He then retired towards Civita Castellana.

Three days after he had evacuated the city appeared the Norman army under the walls. The Romans had reason to dread — they cordially hated (their hatred affected the tone of contempt) these barbarous Northmen. The gates were closed, the walls manned for defence. But on the first day the Normans surprised

the gate of St. Lorenzo: the city, which had for three years defied the besieging army of Henry, was Normans take the city. at once in their power.¹ The first act of the dutiful son of the Church was to release the Pope from his imprisonment in the Castle of St. Angelo. He conducted him with the utmost respect to the Lateran Palace. But Gregory must now witness those horrors which, as long as they afflicted Germany or Northern Italy, he had contemplated unmoved, intent on building up his all-ruling Theocracy. From the feet of the Pope, having just received his blessing, the Normans spread through the city, treating it with all the cruelty of a captured town, pillaging, violating, murdering, wherever they met with opposition. The Romans had been surprised, not subdued. For two days and nights Insurrection. they brooded over their vengeance; on the third day they broke out in general insurrection, rushed armed into the streets, and began a terrible carnage of their conquerors. The Normans were feasting in careless security; but with the discipline of practised soldiers they flew to arms; the whole city was one wild conflict. The Norman horse poured into the streets, but the Romans fought at advantage, from their possession of the houses and their knowledge of the ground. They were gaining the superiority; the Normans saw their peril. The remorseless Guiscard gave the word to fire the houses. From every quarter the flames rushed up — houses, palaces, convents, churches, as the night darkened, were seen in awful conflagration. The distracted inhabitants dashed wildly into the streets,

¹ Non per triennium ut Henricus, sed sequente die, quam venit, perfidam civitatem cepit. — Bonizo.

no longer endeavoring to defend themselves, but to save their families. They were hewn down by hundreds. The Saracen allies of the Pope had been the foremost in the pillage, and were now the foremost in the conflagration and the massacre. No house, no monastery, was secure from plunder, murder, rape. Nuns were defiled, matrons forced, the rings cut from their living fingers.¹ Gregory exerted himself, not without success, in saving the principal churches. It is probable, however, that neither Goth nor Vandal, neither Greek nor German, brought such desolation on the city as this capture by the Normans. From this period dates the desertion of the older part of the city, and its gradual extension over the site of the modern city, the Campus Martius.

Guiscard was at length master of the ruins of Rome, but the vengeance of the Pope's deliverer was yet unappeased. Many thousand Romans were sold publicly as slaves—many carried into the remotest parts of Calabria.² We have heard no remonstrance from the Bishop, from the Sovereign of Rome, on this hateful alliance with the enemies of the faith, the Saracens. Of this, perhaps, he was ignorant when in the Castle of

¹ Itaque gens diversa, de Deo ignara, sceleribus ac homicidiis edocta, adulterii variisque fornicationibus assuefacta, omnibus criminibus quæ ferro et igne, talibus agi solet negotiis, sese furialiter immerserat : quin etiam virgines sacratas corrumpentes, miserorumque Romanorum uxores incestantes, ac annulos earum digitis detruncantes. — Landulph Sen. iv. 3. The hostile writer lays all to Gregory's charge. Cum Roberto exiliens, Salernum profectus est. Ubi per pauca vivens tempora tanquam malorum pœnam emeritus, interiit.

² Bonizo relates and triumphs in this act of vengeance. Dehinc apud Lateranense palatium per multos dies degens (the Pope, too, was in the Lateran palace) multa millia Romanorum vendidit *ut Judæos*; quosdam vero captivos duxit usque Calabriam; et tali pœnâ digni erant multari, qui ad similitudinem Judæorum pastorem suorum tradiderant.

St. Angelo. No powerful intercession is now made — no threatened excommunication is now menaced — in behalf of his rebellious, his perfidious, yet subdued subjects — most of the sufferers, no doubt, guiltless and defenceless. The ferocious Guiscard is still recognized as his ally, his deliverer, his protector, perhaps his avenger.

Unprotected by his foreign guard, the Pope could not now trust himself in the city, which would, no doubt, and not without justice, attribute its ruin and misery to his obstinacy. In the company of Robert Guiscard, oppressed with shame and affliction, he retired from the smoking ruins and the desolated streets of the city of St. Peter, first to the monastery of Monte Casino, afterwards to the Norman's strong castle of Salerno. From Salerno, unshaken by the horrors which
Gregory retires from Rome. July, 1084. he had witnessed or the perils he had escaped, Hildebrand thundered out again the unmitigated excommunication against Henry, the Anti-Pope Clement, and all their adherents.¹

To Rome Gregory never returned: death came
His death. slowly upon him at Salerno. He spoke even to the end with undoubting confidence on the goodness of his cause, and his assurance that he was departing to Heaven. He gave a general absolution to mankind; but from this all-embracing act of mercy he excepted his deadly enemies and those of the Church, Henry so called the King, the usurping Pontiff Guibert, and those

¹ At quia Normannorum instabilitas urbe capta, et prædæ data, multa mala perpetraverit, nobilium Romanorum filias stuprando et nocentes pariter innocentesque pari pœnâ affligendo, nullumque modum, uti victoribus mos est, in rapinâ, crudelitate, direptione habendo . . . veritusque ne duce recedente infidelitas Romana exagitata crudesceret, et quos antea habuerit quasi fidos amicos, pateretur infidos, cedendum tempori arbitratu, Salernum se contulit. — Hugon. Chron. ii. ; Pertz, viii. p. 462.

who were their counsellors and abettors in their ungodly cause. His last memorable words have something of proud bitterness: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile." The words might not be intended as an arraignment of Divine Providence, but where was the beauty of resignation? or was it a Pharisaic reproach on the wickedness of mankind, blind and ungrateful to his transcendent virtues? May 25, 1085. "In exile," said a Churchman of congenial feelings, whose priestly pride was not rebuked by that spectacle of mortality, "in exile thou couldst not die! Vicar of Christ and his Apostles, thou hast received the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession!"¹

Gregory is the Cæsar of spiritual conquest; the great and inflexible assertor of the supremacy of the sacerdotal order. The universal religious Character of Gregory. Autocracy, the Caliphate, with the difference that the temporal power was accessory to the spiritual, not the spiritual an hereditary appendage to the temporal supremacy, expanded itself upon the austere yet imaginative mind of Gregory as the perfect Idea of the Christian Church. The theory of Augustine's City of God, no doubt, swam before the mind of the Pontiff, in which a new Rome was to rise and rule the world by religion. Augustine's theory, indeed, was aristocratic rather than monarchical, or rather the monarchical power remained centered in the Invisible Lord — in Christ himself. To the Pope there could be no Rome without a Cæsar, and the Cæsar of the spiritual monarchy was himself: in him was gathered and centred all power, that of the

¹ Bernried, 109, 110.

collective priesthood and episcopacy ; it flowed from him with a kind of Pantheistic emanation, and was reabsorbed in him. But, unhappily, the ideal Pope is as purely imaginary as an ideal King, or an ideal Republic governed by virtue alone. The Pope was to be a man elected by men. If this spiritual monarchy either could confine, or had attempted to confine that universal authority to which it aspired, or that vast authority which it actually obtained over the hopes and fears of men, to purposes purely and exclusively spiritual : if it could have contented itself with enforcing, and by strictly religious means, an uniformity — a wise and liberal uniformity — an uniformity expanding with the expansion of the human intellect, of Christian faith and practice and Christian virtue throughout the whole Christian community : if it had restrained itself, in its warfare, to the extirpation of evil, to the promotion of social and domestic virtue ; if in its supremacy over kings, to the suppression of unchristian vices, tyranny, injustice, inhumanity ; over mankind at large, to moral transgressions and infringements on the rights and persons and property of others : if it had taught invariably by Christian means of persuasion ; if it had always kept the ultimate end of all religion in view, the happiness of mankind through Christian holiness and love : then posterity might wisely regret that this higher than Platonic vision was never realized ; that mankind are receding further than ever from the establishment in this form of the Christian commonwealth of nations. But throughout the contest of many centuries the sacerdotal supremacy was constantly raising the suspicion, too well grounded, that power, not the beneficial use of power, was its final object. It was occasionally popular, even

democratic, in assisting the liberties of man, as in later times, in its alliance with the Italian republics ; but it was too manifestly not from the high and disinterested love of freedom, but from jealousy of any other Lord over the liberties of men but itself. In this respect Gregory was the type, the absolute model and example of the spiritual monarch. Posterity demands whether his imperial views, like those of the older Cæsar, were not grounded on the total prostration of the real liberty of mankind ; even in that of the liberty of the subordinate sacerdotal order. It was a magnificent Idea, but how was it reconcilable with the genuine sublimity of Christianity, that an order of men — that one single man — had thrust himself without authority, to an extent men began early to question, between man and God — had arrayed himself, in fact, in secondary divinity ? Against his decrees every insurrection of the human mind was treason ; every attempt to limit his power impiety. Even if essentially true, this monarchical autocracy was undeniably taught and maintained, and by none more than by Hildebrand, through means utterly at variance with the essence of Christianity, at the sacrifice of all the higher principles, by bloody and desolating wars, by civil wars with all their horrors, by every kind of human misery. Allow the utmost privilege of the age — of a warlike, a ferocious age, in which human life had no sanctity or security — yet this demand of indulgence for the spirit of the times is surely destructive of the claim to be immutable Christianity : the awful incongruity between the Churchman and the Christian, between the Representative of the Prince of Peace and the Prince of Peace himself, is fatal to the whole.

Yet in a lower view, not as a permanent, eternal, immutable law of Christianity, but as one of the temporary phases, through which Christianity, in its self-accommodation to the moral necessities of men, was to pass, the hierarchical, the Papal power of the Middle Ages, by its conservative fidelity as guardian of the most valuable reliques of antiquity, of her arts, her laws, her language ; by its assertion of the superiority of moral and religious motives over the brute force of man ; by the safe guardianship of the great primitive and fundamental truths of religion, which were ever lurking under the exuberant mythology and ceremonial ; above all by wonderful and stirring examples of the most profound, however ascetic devotion, of mortification and self-sacrifice and self-discipline, partially, at least, for the good of others ; by splendid charities, munificent public works, cultivation of letters, the strong trust infused into the mind of man, that there was some being even on earth whose special duty it was to defend the defenceless, to succor the succorless, to be the refuge of the widow and orphan, to be the guardian of the poor ; all these things, with all the poetry of the Middle Ages, in its various forms of legend, of verse, of building, of music, of art, may justify, or rather command mankind to look back upon these fallen idols with reverence, with admiration, and with gratitude. The hierarchy of the Middle Ages counterbalances its vast ambition, rapacity, cruelty, by the most essential benefits to human civilization. The Papacy itself is not merely an awful, but a wonderful institution. Gregory VII. himself is not contemplated merely with awe, but in some respects, and with great drawbacks, as a benefactor of mankind.

CHAPTER IV.

GREGORY'S SUCCESSORS.

GREGORY VII. had died in exile, overpowered, if unsubdued; a fugitive before the face of his enemies, yet disdaining to yield one point of his lofty pretensions. But who would take his place and maintain with equal vigor and intrepidity the imperilled Papacy? The last of that race of men who had labored with Hildebrand for the establishment of the Italian, monastic, Hildebrandine Papacy, was Desiderius, the Abbot of Monte Casino: the sharer in his counsels, his supporter in all his difficulties. Gregory had already designated, on one occasion, Desiderius as the future Pope; and when his faithful adherents pressed around him, to endeavor to obtain from his dying lips the nomination of his successor, he had in the first instance named Desiderius; in default of his acceptance of the office (which Gregory seems to have anticipated), he added three Prelates, Otto of Ostia, Hugh of Lyons, and Anselm of Lucca. Even in Salerno Desiderius was urged to accept the Pontificate; but he was advanced in years; he was determined not to abandon the holy quiet of Monte Casino. He retired to his monastery, and was followed by the Cardinals and Bishops of the party, still pressing upon him the onerous

distinction.¹ His obstinate humility resisted their flattering importunities. But he acquiesced in the necessity of taking measures to elect a legitimate Pope, under the protection of the Countess Matilda. The summer heats prevented any approach to Rome. In the autumn, apprehending that they were about to compel him to assume the office, he exacted a promise from the Roman Cardinals and Bishops, from the Norman Princes, from Jordano of Capua, and Count Rainulf, that they would neither themselves use any violence to compel him to be Pope, nor permit others to do so. • Thus May 25, 1085.
May 24, 1086. passed a year. In the mean time, the Anti-Pope, Clement III., ruled in part of Rome; his progress excited increasing apprehension. At Easter many Cardinals and Prelates ventured to enter Rome from different quarters; they sent to summon Desiderius, and the Bishops and Cardinals who had taken refuge in Monte Casino, with Gysulf, Prince of Salerno. Desiderius, not suspecting any design upon himself, hastened with his Bishops to Rome. On the eve of Pentecost there was a great assemblage of the clergy, and the diaconate of the Church of Saint Lucia; again the Pontificate was pressed on Desiderius by the unanimous voice; again he refused it, and threatened to return to Monte Casino. A private meeting was held between the leaders of the ecclesiastical party and Cencius, the Consul of Rome (a Cencius now on the high Papalist side); it was determined to elect the Bishop of Ostia, with the singular provision that Desiderius should pledge

¹ Waltram de Unit. Eccles. gives a list of the German bishops on each side after Gregory's death, in 1085. Some bishops, Adelbero of Wurtzburg, gave up their sees. Henry filled up all these vacancies: in Metz, however, there was no episcopal function performed for ten years. — P. 315.

himself to receive the new Pope in his impregnable fortress convent of Monte Casino, to assist his cause, and protect him from all his enemies. Desiderius consented at once; and with the abbot's crosier, which he held in his hand, pledged the fealty of his people. Another public assemblage took place, more crowded, more imposing; the suffrages were nearly all united in favor of the Bishop of Ostia; when a Cardinal arose, and urged the objection which had so often before been overruled, that the translation of a Bishop from one see to another was against the Canons. The whole assembly rose, seized the struggling Desiderius, hurried him A.D. 1087. into the Church of Saint Lucia, and proclaimed him Pope, under the name of Victor III. Desiderius, to show his unyielding reluctance, though arrayed in the scarlet cope, refused to put on the alb.

The Imperial Prefect, overawed by the Norman forces, which, under Gysulf, Prince of Salerno, had accompanied Desiderius to Rome, and by the powerful Cencius, had not ventured to disturb these proceedings. But the Prince of Salerno seized the opportunity of demanding the consecration of a creature of his own as the Archbishop of that city: this was sternly refused by Desiderius and his Bishops. The Prefect seized the opportunity of the defection of Gysulf; collected some troops, seized the Capitol, and threatened the safety of the new Pope. Four days after his election Desiderius fled from Rome; he remained three days at Ardea; at Terracina he put off all May 27. the Papal insignia, returned to Monte Casino the simple Abbot, as if determined to close his days in peace in his humbler sphere: no remonstrances, no representations of the desolate condition of the Church could induce

him to resume his state ; for nearly a whole year the Church remained without an ostensible head ; the Anti-Pope Guibert without a rival. Otto, Bishop of Ostia, had quietly submitted to the loss of the tiara, which had so nearly fallen upon his head, and thus paved the way

for his own speedy election as Urban II.
Hugh of Lyons.

Hugh of Lyons has left a bitter record of his disappointed ambition : he was absent from Rome at the time of the election, but acquiesced in the inauguration of Desiderius. He visited Monte Casino ; and if there be the shadow of truth in the incredible scheme, which, writing to the Countess Matilda, he declares that he heard from the lips of Desiderius, and from other bishops to whose testimony he refers the Countess, Desiderius must have contemplated a total departure from the policy of Pope Gregory. He openly asserted that he had consented to crown King Henry ; more incredible still, he averred that the invasion of the patrimony of St. Peter by Henry was with his cognizance and assent. Pope Victor III. was guilty of other acts of treason against the memory of Gregory : he declared one Bishop elect, though absolved by Gregory, still under excommunication ; Atto of March 21. Milan, though he had died impenitent, unab-
 solved from his excommunication, to be among the blessed ; and that himself should desire no higher place in glory than that of Atto.¹ His ordinary conversation was a continued reproof of the acts of Gregory ; he had even proposed the election of a German Pope, Herman of Metz. These are either calumnies, utterly groundless and sheerly mendacious, or exaggerations of some peaceful counsels which Desiderius, weary of strife, and

¹ The two letters of Hugh of Lyons to Matilda in Labbe, Concil.— P. 414.

under the fond hope of restoring peace to the Church, may have ventured to suggest in his ^{Mid-Lent, 1087.} holy solitude.

Early in the spring, not two weeks after his retirement, assembled at Capua many Bishops and Cardinals; among the latter, Otto of Ostia and Hugh of Lyons, Cencius the Consul of Rome, Jordano ^{Desiderius resumes the Pontificate.} Prince of Capua, and Roger Duke of Apulia, with other Norman princes, as Hugh of Lyons no doubt hoped, to elect a new Pope. But the partisans of Desiderius, at his own secret suggestions (according to the malicious statement of Hugh of Lyons), or rather the whole assembly, urged Desiderius, even with prayers and tears, to resume his Pontificate. After two days' resistance, he yielded at length; and notwithstanding the remonstrances of Otto and the stricter Cardinals, submitted to pay what seemed the price of hearty support from the Norman Princes; he submitted to the consecration of Alfano, who was accused of aspiring to the see by unlawful means, as Archbishop of Salerno. He returned on Palm Sunday to Monte Casino, where he celebrated Easter. He then advanced, under the escort of the Princes of Capua and Salerno, crossed the Tiber near the city of Ostia, which perhaps its Bishop ^{May 9.} maintained in his allegiance; and pitched his tents before the Church of St. Peter, now occupied or rather garrisoned by the Anti-Pope Guibert. A sudden attack of the Norman soldiery made him master of the Church. On the Sunday after Ascension, in the presence of multitudes of the Normans, chiefly from the Transteverine region, where his party predominated, he was consecrated by the Roman Bishops of Ostia, Porto, Tusculum, and Alba, with many other Cardinals and

Prelates. But he ventured on no long stay in the insecure capital; after eight days he retired to Bari, and thence to Monte Casino.

Shortly afterwards the Countess Matilda entered Rome; she sent earnest messages to the Pope; it was chiefly to see and to enjoy the converse of the Holy Pontiff that she had gone to Rome. Victor, though laboring under the infirmities of age and sickness, embarked on the coast, and landed at Ostia. He was received with the utmost respect by the Countess Matilda. His partisans were still in possession of St. Peter's; on St. Barnabas' Day he celebrated mass on the high altar. The day closed with a sudden irruption of the forces of Matilda and the Pope into the city itself, which was chiefly in the possession of the Anti-Pope. Victor was master of the whole Transteverine region, of St. Peter's, of the Castle of St. Angelo, and considerable part of Rome, with the cities of Ostia and Porto. But on St. Peter's Eve an Imperial messenger arrived; he summoned the Senators, the Consuls, and the people of Rome, on their allegiance to the crown, to abandon the cause of Victor. The versatile people rose on his side, drove out the troops of Matilda, who still from the heights above maintained possession of the Church of St. Peter. This became the centre of the bloody strife; men warred with the utmost fury as to who should celebrate the Apostle's holyday in his great church.¹ Neither party obtained this triumph; the altar remained the whole day without light, incense, or

¹ According to the *Chronicon Augustense* Guibert was absent from Rome when it was thus surprised by his rival Victor. That chronicle gives the darker and Imperialist character of Desiderius and his proceedings. He is accused of buying the Norman aid, and by that purchased aid alone obtained a triumph for the monkish party. — *Apud Freher.*, vol. i.

sacrifice ; for the discomfited troops of the Pope were forced to take refuge in the Castle of St. Angelo ; these of the Anti-Pope did not yet venture to take possession of the Church. Guibert celebrated high mass in the neighboring Church of Santa Maria, with the two towers or belfries, from both of which he had just smoked or burned out the garrison. The next day the partisans of Guibert took possession of St. Peter's, washed the altar clean from the pollution of the hostile mass, and then celebrated the holy Eucharist. But their triumph, too, was short ; the following day they were again driven out ; and Pope Victor ruled in St. Peter's.

Yet Victor dared not remain in Rome ; he retired again to his Monte Casino.¹ In August a council was held at Benevento. Pope Victor III. presided in the assembly, and renewed in the strongest terms the excommunication of Guibert the Anti-Pope, who, by the aid of the Imperial arms, not fearing the judgment of the great Eternal Emperor, had filled Rome with every kind of violence, crime, and bloodshed, invaded the pontifical throne, and driven forth the rightful Pope. To this excommunication was subjoined another against Hugh of Lyons and the Abbot of Marseilles. The abbot had been party to the election of Pope Victor. The archbishop had offered his allegiance, implored and received from him the legation to France. Yet their

¹ The Monks of Monte Casino boasted of a wonder which took place at the shrine of St. Benedict. Among the pilgrims who approached the altar was one in ecclesiastical attire. He was asked who he was ; he replied, "St. Peter. I am come to celebrate the day of my martyrdom at the altar of my brother Benedict ; since I cannot stay at Rome, where my church is desecrated by strife and war." The monks of Monte Casino celebrated from thenceforth St. Peter's day with the same solemnity as that of St. Benedict, a comparison which provokes the indignant remonstrance of Cardinal Baronius.

ambition, disappointed of the Papacy, had driven them into open schism; they had cut themselves off from the Roman Church, and therefore, as self-condemned heretics, were excluded from that communion. The condemnation was renewed of all who should receive the investiture to any ecclesiastical benefice whatever from the hands of the laity. But even before the close of the council Victor was seized with a mortal malady. He had hardly time to retire to Monte Casino, to order the affairs of his monastery, to commend Oderisi as his successor to the abbacy of Monte Casino, the Bishop of Ostia to the throne of the Pontificate. He died in three days.

Death of
Victor III.

A.D. 1087.
Sept. 16.

In those times of blind and obstinate mutual hostility no rapid death, common enough, especially in that climate, could take place without suggesting a providential judgment, or something out of the course of nature. In Germany it was rumored and believed that the Pope, while celebrating mass, in ratification of the excommunicating decrees of the council, was seized with his mortal pains,¹ and that his foetid body was hardly removed from the church. Later writers, with no ground whatever, imputed his death to poison administered in the sacred chalice.²

¹ Chronicon Augustense sub ann.

² Dandulus in Chronic. T. xii. Rev. Ital. Martinus Polonus.

CHAPTER V.

URBAN II.

THE Pontificate of Urban II. is one of the great epochs in the history of the Papacy and of Latin Christianity. The first Crusade united Christendom in one vast warlike confederacy ; and at the head of that confederacy the Pope, by common consent, took his proper place. The armies were the armies of the faith, and therefore the armies of him who represented the chief apostle of the faith. From the Pope they derived, what they believed their divine commission ; they were his martial missionaries to recover, not for any one Christian prince, but for Christianity itself, that territory to which it asserted an indefeasible title. The land in which the Saviour of mankind was born and died, could not but be the domain, the seignorial possession of the Christian Church.

But the Crusade belongs to the later period of Urban's Pontificate.

On the death of Victor III. the scattered and disorganized monastic or Hildebrandine party were struck almost with despair : yet messengers were sent on all sides to rally their ecclesiastical forces. It was not till above five months had elapsed, that a Council summoned by a number of bishops assembled at Monte Casino, and by the counsel of Oderisi,

A.D. 1088.
March 12.

the Abbot, the successor of Desiderius, met at Terracina; for Rome was in the power of the enemy. The number of archbishops, bishops, and abbots was forty. The Bishop of Porto, with the Bishop of Tusculum, represented the Roman clergy; the Prefect Benedict appeared, and boasted that he bore the unanimous suffrage of the Roman people. There were ambassadors from some Ultramontane prelates, and from the Countess Matilda. After a solemn fast of three days the Bishop of Ostia was elected by acclamation, arrayed in the pontifical robes, and placed on the pontifical throne.

March 13,
1088.

Otto, Bishop of Ostia, was by birth a Frenchman, of Rheims or of some town in the neighborhood. He had been brought up under the severe monastic discipline of Clugny; to embrace this rule he had surrendered the dignity of a canon at Rheims. His instructor had been the famous Bruno, the founder of the Carthusian Order. There was no more bold or sincere asserter of ecclesiastical power; his hostility towards the Emperor had been embittered by his imprisonment and hard usage during the time that he was in the power of Henry. Urban lost no time in proclaiming himself as the elected Pope to the sovereigns of Christian Europe.¹

Some sudden and unexplained revolution enabled Urban to hold a council at Rome in the year after his election. It is probable that the reconciliation, through his intervention, between the sons of Robert Guiscard, Roger and Bohemond, may have placed some Norman forces at his command. One hundred and fifteen bishops ventured to assemble around the Pope.²

¹ Urbani Epist. apud Martene et Durand. A. C. i. 520.

² Among Urban's first acts was the elevation of the Archbishop of Toledo,

The excommunication against the Simonians and the Anti-Pope was renewed in unmitigated rigor: on the Emperor he seems to have preserved a cautious silence. Guibert, shut up by the Romans in one of the strong fortresses of the city, began to enter into negotiations for his peaceful departure. But neither did Urban venture to take up his residence in Rome. He retired to the faithful south: at Amalfi he summoned another council, the decrees of which were marked by the sternly monastic character of the Hildebrandine school.¹

Urban had all the resolute firmness of Gregory, but firmness less aggressive, and tempered with the wisdom of the serpent. His subtler policy was more dangerous, and eventually more fatal, to the Imperial cause, than the more bold and violent oppugnancy of Hildebrand. The times needed consummate prudence. Even in the south the Normans were but uncertain allies, and protectors who rarely failed to exact some grant or privilege in return for their protection. Rome was on that party which at the time could awe her with the greatest power or win her by the most lavish wealth. The Countess Matilda still faithfully maintained the Papal interests in the north of Italy; she still firmly rejected the claims of the Anti-Pope; and had taken great part in the election, first of Victor III., now of Urban II. But Anselm of Lucca, who had ruled her mind with his religious authority, was now dead; the firmness, even the fidelity of Matilda might yield to the overpow-

now won from the Saracens, to the Primacy of Spain. — Florez, *España Sagrada*, vi. 347.

¹ Bernold. Chron. A.D. 1089 (see Stenzel). Jaffé, in the *Regesta*, assembles the 115 bishops at Amalfi.

ering strength of the Imperial party. A terrible event showed the ferocity with which the hatred of the conflicting factions raged in those cities. Bonizo, the expelled Bishop of Sutri (who had written with great vehemence in defence of Hildebrand), was received in Parma as Bishop by the Papal party; the Imperial faction seized him, threw him into prison, plucked out his eyes, and put him to a horrible death by mutilation.

Though in this model of female perfection the clergy, especially the monastic clergy, might, in ordinary times, have expected and admired the great crowning virtue of the sex, virginity, yet it was for the Pope, with his approbation if not in obedience to his commands, that she yielded to what at first at least seemed feminine weakness. She consented, at the age of forty-three, to marry a youth of eighteen. Even this sacrifice was to

Marriage of
Countess
Matilda.

be made for the welfare of the Church.¹ Matilda wedded Guelf the younger, the son of the powerful Duke of Bavaria, from the family most equal to cope with the Imperial power. This alliance not merely might give manly strength to her counsels, and a warlike leader to her arms in Italy, but it secured her an alliance in Germany itself, dangerous and menacing to King Henry. The marriage was at first kept secret from the Emperor. No sooner was it announced than Henry found it necessary to march into Italy to crush this powerful confederacy. He laid siege to Mantua; after eleven months' resistance he became master of the town by treachery. For two years

¹ A.D. 1089. *Tam pro incontinentiâ, quam pro Romani pontificis obedi-
entiâ, videlicet ut tanto virilius sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ contra schismaticos
posset subvenire.* — Berthold. *Const. in Chronic.* Thus the marriage ap-
peared at first sight to the monastic writers: the close of this connexion
perhaps showed the injustice of their fears.

the war continued, so greatly to the advantage of the Emperor that the vassals of Matilda began to remonstrate against her obstinate hostility. She was Sept. 1092. compelled to open negotiations for peace at Carpineto, not far from Canosa. The recognition of the Anti-Pope was the stern and inexorable demand of Henry. The pious Matilda assembled the bishops, the abbots, and the holy hermits, many of whom had taken refuge in her strong fortress from the wild soldiery. She declared herself ready to make peace on just terms. The Bishop of Reggio and the other prelates advised submission, and the abandonment of Urban and his hopeless cause.¹ But a hermit named John sprang up, and declared with all the fire of an inspired prophet, that peace with Henry on such terms would be sin October. against the Holy Ghost. The treaty was broken off; the war raged again, but Henry miscarried in an attack on the strong castle of Montorio; his besieging engines were burned; one of his natural sons slain in the trenches. He made an attempt to surprise Canosa; the scene of his humiliation he hoped to make the scene of his revenge. The troops of Matilda not only succeeded in relieving Canosa, but, covered by a thick fog fell on the rear of Henry's army: the Imperial banner was trailed in the dust, taken, and hung up as a trophy by the victorious Matilda in the church of St. Apollonia at Canosa.

But Urban and Matilda found more useful allies in the bosom of the king's own family. The terrible and revolting tragedy in his own household combined with the unfavorable circumstances in Germany and in Northern Italy to subdue the haughty spirit of Henry. In

¹ See authorities in Stenzel, p. 547.

Germany the elder Guelf, the Duke of Bavaria, thwarted all his measures. Swabia refused allegiance to Frederick of Hohenstauffen, and chose for her prince Berthold, the brother of Gebhard Bishop of Constance, one of Henry's implacable enemies. At a diet in Ulm the States, rejecting Arnold, the bishop named by the Emperor and the Anti-Pope, submitted to Gebhard of Constance as the legate of Pope Urban. They proclaimed a Truce of God until Easter, 1096, for the protection of the estates of the bishops, churches, and monasteries, and of the merchants. The cities eagerly embraced the boon; it was accepted through almost the whole of Southern Germany from the borders of Hungary to Alsace. These were difficult and embarrassing measures; but it was the revolt of his beloved son Conrad which crushed Henry to the earth.

Conrad was a youth of great beauty, gentle disposition, with profound religious impressions, a weak and dreamy character. His sensitive piety surrendered him to the influence of the more austere clergy, who found means of access to his inmost heart. He was shocked with the horrors, with the sacrilegious evils of war, the desecration of churches, the ruin of monasteries. If such were his feelings, his acts were those of unmeasured and unscrupulous ambition. His piety was soon taught to spurn the vulgar virtues of love and obedience to his father. Henry, perhaps on a somewhat questionable title, had endeavored to obtain for him the rich inheritance of his grandmother, Adelheid of Susa. With this view he had carried him to Italy, and left him there to prosecute his claim, but exposed to those fatal influences of the Papal clergy. His father's enemies held out a nobler prize—the

Prince
Conrad.

immediate possession of the kingdom of Italy. For neither did the devout Matilda nor the austere Pope decline this unnatural alliance, though it may be doubtful how far they secretly prompted and encouraged at first this breach of the laws of nature.¹ But it is curious to observe how constantly that proverbial hostility of the heirs of kings to their fathers was sanctioned by those who were bound by their station to assert the loftiest Christian morality and the strictest adherence to the commandments of God. So completely was the churchman's interest to absorb all others, that crimes thus against nature, not only were excused by the ordinary passions of men, but by those of the high-
A.D. 1093.
 est pretensions to Christian holiness. What Pope ever, if it promised advantage, refused the alliance of a rebellious son.

The cause which Conrad assigned, or which was assigned by Conrad's new friends, for his revolt, was too monstrous to obtain credit except with those whose minds were prepared to receive it by long and bitter hatred: it is altogether irreconcilable with the conduct of Henry. It was no plea of deep religious scruple at the disobedience of his father to the Church, or his sacrilegious destruction of holy things and holy places. It was an accusation against his father connected with that foul story of the Empress, which ere long obtained such appalling publicity at the council of Piacenza. On Conrad's refusal to commit incest with his mother-in-law, it is even said with the sanction of Henry (the revolting history must be given in plain words), the Emperor had threatened to stigmatize and disinherit

¹ The honest Muratori observes, "Un grande incanto a i figliuoli d' Adamo è la vista d' una corona." — *Ann. d' Italia*.

him as a bastard, on no other evidence than the want of likeness to himself, and so to insult the memory of his mother Bertha, which nevertheless Henry cherished with tender reverence to the close of his life ; and even at that time the father was striving by violence to put him in possession of the territory of Susa ; and the effect, almost the fatal effect, of his conduct on the king his father, can only be ascribed to profound affection, deeply, cruelly, wantonly wounded. It is true that on the discovery of his treasonable intrigues Henry had placed his son under arrest ; but Conrad found means to escape, and was received with open arms by the triumphant Matilda. His new allies kept their faith with the revolted son, under whose banner they might now contend with renewed hope, and whom it was their interest to commit irreparably with his father. Conrad was crowned King of Italy, first at Monza, afterwards at Milan, in the Ambrosian Church. Anselm, the archbishop, hitherto on the Imperial side, embraced the stronger party : Milan, Cremona, Lodi, and Piacenza fell off at once from the cause of Henry, and signed a treaty of mutual defence for twenty years against the Empire.¹

The revolt of Conrad seemed to crush the Emperor to the earth.² He had borne all the vicissitudes of his earlier life with unbroken courage ; he had risen from his humiliation at Canosa with refreshed energy ; he now abandoned himself to despair, threw off the robes and insignia of royalty, and was hardly prevented by his friends from falling on his own sword.

¹ Anselm died Dec. 4, 1093.

² Even the monkish historian, as Stenzel observes, almost feels compassion, *nimio dolore afflictus*.—Bernold.

As the affairs of the Empire became more dark, the Pope emerged from his place of refuge in the convent fortress of Monte Casino, or in some one of the Norman cities under Norman protection.¹ The temporary success of Henry had emboldened the Roman party of Guibert. He had returned to Rome. ^{March 26, 1094.} But Urban ventured to approach and to celebrate Christmas, 1093, in that city. He took up his abode in the palace of one of the Frangipanis. The Anti-Pope held the Vatican, the castle of St. Angelo, and the Lateran; the rest of the city rendered its allegiance to Urban. Early in the following year (Guibert had then fled to Henry, and had even expressed his readiness, if peace could be restored on no other terms, to lay down his papal dignity), fifteen days before Easter, Ferruccio who occupied the Lateran for the Anti-Pope Guibert, offered to surrender his charge for a large sum of money. But Urban, whose only resources had been the devotional offerings of the churches and convents in Southern Italy, and of those who came from more distant regions to acknowledge his supremacy or to bring their affairs before his tribunal, was too poor to pay the price. Fortunately Godfrey, the wealthy Abbot of Vendôme on the Loire, was at Rome; he had brought with him considerable treasures; besides these he sold his mules and horses, and laid the whole sum at the feet of the Pope. The Christmas of the same year (1094) Urban kept in Tuscany. On the 1st of March he advanced, and at the Council of Piacenza struck the last mortal blow at the fame and popularity of Henry, at the Anti- ^{Council of Piacenza. March 1-7, 1095.}

¹ Urban is at different times at Bari, Brundisium, Capua, Benevento, Troja, Salerno, Anagni, and other less known places. See Jaffé, Regesta.

Pope, and the party of the married clergy. It was not, however, the expectation of this triumph of the Pope over the empire, or even the exhibition of the Empress as the accuser of her husband, but rather the universal pre-occupation with the proposed appeal to Christendom on behalf of their Eastern brethren, the proclamation of a Crusade for the conquest of the Holy Land, which swelled the enormous multitudes assembled at the Council of Piacenza. Bishops and abbots crowded from Italy, France, Bavaria, Burgundy, and most parts of Germany. There were 3,000 of the clergy, 30,000 of the laity; no church or public building could contain the vast host. They met in the great plain outside of the city: the ambassadors of the Emperor of the East were present to implore the aid of Christendom against the Unbelievers, who were before the gates of Constantinople.

The Pope would have been more than man not to have seized this opportunity of obtaining the sanction of this vast Christian assembly to his condemnation of his enemies — of compelling them to witness the humiliation of the Emperor. Before this assembly appeared Adelaide, or Praxedes (as she is also named), the daughter of a King, the widow of a powerful Prince of Germany, the wife of the Emperor, to accuse her husband of enormities better, it might have seemed, concealed in the sanctuary of the confessional than proclaimed aloud in all their loathsome detail, to infect the ears of Christendom.¹

March 7,
1095.

Charges
made by the
Empress.

¹ Donizo relates, to the praise of Matilda, her share in this transaction. He has misplaced the revolt of the son, which he relates after the flight of the empress. That revolt he compares to the just judgment of God on the Egyptians by the loss of their first born.

Illius tractat patrem (Matilda) sic Hester ut Aman.

Abstulit uxorem sibi primitus, ut modo prolem.

Vit. Mathild. ii. xi.

These charges had already been rehearsed in a Council at Constance, before the Bishop Gebhard, the implacable enemy of Henry. The Empress had been left in prison at Verona; a party of Matilda's soldiers surprised the guards, and rescued the captive April, 1094. Princess. It is almost incredible, that even in a coarse age, with that deadness to delicacy which belongs to monastic life, and to the now almost universal practice of confession, that the clergy should instigate, an ecclesiastical assembly listen without repugnance to the public depositions, or at least to the attestation of depositions publicly read by a wife against her husband, so loathsome, so unnatural. The Empress accused her husband of abandoning her, or rather of compelling her to submit to promiscuous violation by his court and camp; of urging her to incest with her own son. After times are left to some one of these wretched alternatives—to believe in dissoluteness almost bestial, without any motive but absolute depravity, and with some of the circumstances which form an integral part of the story absolutely contradictory; or in an almost inconceivable depth of malignity in Henry's enemies—malignity too much, indeed, betrayed during the proceedings of the Council; or in the most wicked and shameless unprompted falsehood in the Empress, shameless enough, even if all were true; or (we fear it is but a subterfuge to find a merciful construction) some insanity on her part, which the simple believed, the crafty made use of for their own purposes.

But without waiting any reply or defence from the Emperor, the Pope and the Assembly admitted the whole charges as undeniable, unexaggerated truth. With an ostentatious leniency the Empress was excused

from all penitential discipline, as having been the unassenting victim of the crimes with which she charged herself. She retired to spend the rest of her days in a monastery. The reception of these charges was almost the total ruin of the Imperial party in Lombardy, which was all but abandoned by Henry himself. Some of his most faithful partisans went over to his son and to the Countess Matilda.

The Council of Piacenza, in all its other decrees, obeyed the dictation of Pope Urban. Canons were passed against the Simoniacs and the married clergy. The Faithful were forbidden to be present at any sacred functions performed by the clergy who had not parted with their wives, branded by the name of concubines. The usual anathemas were uttered with lighted candles against the usurper Guibert, and all who abetted his usurpation. Orders conferred by him, or by Bishops excommunicated by the Pope, were declared null; the opinion of Berengar on the Sacrament was pronounced a heresy.¹

Urban, triumphant in Italy, went on to France, to consummate his more perfect victory over the mind of Christendom in the Council of Clermont. He was met at Cremona by Conrad, King of Italy, who paid him the most humble and obsequious homage.² The Pope promised to maintain him as King of Italy, but exacted his cession of the right of investiture. To complete the alienation of Conrad from his father, and to attach him more closely to the Papal party, a marriage was arranged between him and the

April 10.
Urban in
France.

¹ Bernoldi Chronicon. 1095.

² Rex Conrhadus II. obviam procedens stratoris officio usus est. — Cod. Mus. Brit. apud Pertz, viii. 474.

youthful daughter of the Norman Roger Count of Sicily. She brought him a rich dowry.

Pope Urban had hardly crossed the Alps, when an unexpected revolution in Italy awoke the Em-
Imperial in-
terests revive
in Italy.
 peror again from his prostration and despair.

Marriages contracted under the auspices and at the instigation of the Pope himself seemed not to secure conjugal happiness. No sooner had the party of Matilda gained this uncontested superiority, than a sudden separation took place between the Countess and her youthful husband.¹ Guelf declared that he had never asserted a husband's privilege; he had respected either her age or her religious scruples. Matilda, whether from some lingering womanly vanity, or from humility which shrunk from that fame she would have acquired from her connubial continency, had kept the secret which her husband disclosed in his indiscreet anger. But there were other reasons for this mutual estrangement. So long as she needed his valor and military aid to protect her dominions she had treated him with respect and affection; on her triumph she needed him no longer, and began to show coldness and indifference. The young and ambitious Bavarian might bear with patience the loss of some of his conjugal rights, but there were others, no doubt his chief temptations, which were refused, to his infinite disappointment. The vast possessions to which, by his marriage, he had supposed himself the undoubted successor, had already been made over by a solemn donation to the Church. The Duke of Bavaria, the father of the younger Guelf, made a hasty journey into Italy and endeavored in vain to work up a

¹ Donizo, the panegyrist of Matilda, maintains a prudent silence as to this marriage: he does not even name Guelf.

reconciliation. In his indignation at his ill-success, he threw himself again into the party of the Emperor, and appealed to Henry to compel the Countess to alter the disposition of her dominions in favor of his son. Henry arose from his retreat in the territory of Padua; he summoned his faithful Veronese, and laid siege to Matilda's strong town Nogarà. Matilda rallied her forces to the rescue, and Henry had not strength to maintain the siege. The Guelfs retired to Germany; followed not long after by Henry himself. Matilda, strong in the alliance of Conrad, now connected by marriage with the Norman Roger, and the Papal party, with the King of Italy in the North, the Normans in the South, bade defiance to the enfeebled and disorganized Imperialists, and hoped finally to crush the obstinate Anti-Pope. Yet it was not till two years after that a party of Crusaders, on their way through Rome, reduced the whole city, except the Castle of St. Angelo, to obedience to the Pope. Guibert was at length dispossessed even of the Castle of St. Angelo.¹

Pope Urban, in the mean time, had passed on to accomplish, in a more congenial land, his great purpose, the proclamation of the Crusade. He knew that Italy was not the land which would awaken to a burst of religious enthusiasm at the summons of a Pope; one, too, with a contested title. The maritime cities, Pisa, Genoa, Venice might be roused, as they had been by Victor III., to piratical expeditions against the Mohammedans of Africa, where their pious zeal might be rewarded by rich plunder. But the clergy were too much engrossed and distracted by their own factions, the laity too much divided between the Papal and the

¹ He held it in 1097.

Imperial interests, with the exception of the Normans were by no means so rudely enamored of war as to embark, on an impulse of generous or pious feeling, in a dangerous and unpromising cause. At Piacenza the cold appeal met with a cold reception; the Council came to no determination; even the Pope, occupied with his own more immediate objects, the degradation of the Emperor, the subjugation of the Anti-Pope and the hostile clergy, displayed none of that fiery energy, that kindling eloquence, which he reserved for a more auspicious occasion.

Urban entered France; he celebrated the feast of the Assumption of the Virgin at Puy, in the Velay; he visited many other cities — Tarrascon,¹ Avignon,² Macon on the Saone;³ retired to his beloved Oct. 18, 1095. monastery of Clugny, to await the Council summoned for the 18th of November, at Clermont, in Auvergne. There he remained occupied in confirming and enlarging the privileges conferred by his predecessor on this great centre of the monastic religious movement of the age, and in consecrating the high altar of the church. On his entrance into France he was met by a happy omen and manifestation of his increasing power — the acknowledgment of his title to the Papacy by England. This had been accomplished by Anselm the Norman, the learned Primate of the island.

Urban entered his native France, not deigning to consider that it was the realm of a king whom, if of more daring character, he might have tempted to hostility. But over Philip of France the sentence of excommunication was but suspended; and he cowered before the condemnation of the Pope.

¹ Sept. 11.² Sept. 12.³ Oct. 17.

Philip I., a sovereign of weak character, and not less weak in authority over his almost coequal nobles, having grown weary of his wife Bertha, the daughter of the Count of Holland, had endeavored to divorce her on some frivolous plea of consanguinity not admitted by the clergy. His seduction of Beltrada, the wife of a powerful noble, was an offence against the feudal honor of his great vassals and the duty of a sovereign, as well as against the Church and the religion of Christ. The clergy of France refused to solemnize the unlawful and adulterous marriage. A Norman or a French Bishop¹ had been tempted by gratitude for actual favors, and by the hope of future advantage, to desecrate the holy ceremony. Hugh of Lyons, the rival of Urban for the Pontificate, had been restored to favor, and reinvested in the legatine authority in France. He summoned a National Council at Autun, which ventured to anticipate that sentence which could not but be approved and ratified by the Pope. Philip had implored delay, his ambassadors had appeared at Piacenza, and the Pope had consented for a time to suspend the sentence; an act not perhaps uninfluenced by his desire of humiliating Hugh of Lyons, who had eluded or disregarded the Pope's summons to the Council at Piacenza. But the case was too glaring to escape the censure; the monarch too impotent to demand further delay. In the preliminary business of the Council of Clermont, despatched with haste, hardly noticed, passed the excommunication of the greatest sovereign of Christendom, at least in rank, except the Emperor, the ruler of the country in which the Council

Philip I. of
France.

Excommu-
nicated.

¹ Some authorities assert Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, others the Bishop of Senlis.

sate.¹ So completely were men's minds absorbed by the expectation of that great Event for which they had been so long in preparation, and concerning which they were now wrought to the utmost height of eagerness, the Crusade for the conquest of the Holy Land.

¹ Philip cowered under the ecclesiastical censure. He gave up his royal state. *Nunquam diadema portavit, nec purpuram induit, neque solennitatem aliquam regio more celebravit.* — Orderic. Vit. lib. 8.



THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DAY
STAMPED BELOW

AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS

WILL BE ASSESSED FOR FAILURE TO RETURN
THIS BOOK ON THE DATE DUE. THE PENALTY
WILL INCREASE TO 50 CENTS ON THE FOURTH
DAY AND TO \$1.00 ON THE SEVENTH DAY
OVERDUE.

DEC 7 1933

DEC 8 1933

SEP 14 1936

OCT 3 1936

SEP 27 1938

OCT 26 1938

JAN 12 1948

21 Oct '51 HL

22 Oct '51 L

YC 30035

110

511979

BR162

MS

v.3

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

